

Eighty Year
Vol. 167

THE

Quarterly
No. 335

DUBLIN REVIEW

Oct., Nov., Dec., 1920

LONDON

BURNS, OATES &
WASHBOURNE, LTD

Chicago Ill. U.S.A.

CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY
120 NORTH WABASH AVENUE

Price 5s 6d Net. Yearly Subscription 21s Post Free

HENRY EDWARD MANNING

HIS LIFE AND LABOURS

A NEW BIOGRAPHY by SHANE LESLIE

Demy octavo, over 400 pp., portraits, strongly bound,
one handsome volume, 25s. net

THIS definitive "life" of the great Cardinal is based upon his private papers, and includes many letters from Gladstone hitherto unpublished. New material with reference to the Oxford Movement and its leaders is also included.

READY SHORTLY

25s. NET

LONDON

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD

NEW YORK

P. J. KENEDY AND SONS



New S. P. C. K. Books

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. From Galileo to Bergson.

By JOHN CHARLTON HARDWICK. Cloth boards. 8s. net.

CHRISTIAN MORALS.

By ARTHUR JAMES HUMPHREYS, B.A., D.D. Cloth boards. 4s. net.

THE INCARNATION AND PERSONALITY.

By HERBERT A. WATSON, D.D. Cloth boards. 9s. net.

MONOPHYSITISM PAST AND PRESENT.

By A. A. LUCE, M.C., B.D. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

WALTER DE WENLOK, Abbot of Westminster.

By ERNEST HAROLD PEARCE, Litt.D., F.S.A., Bishop of Worcester. With a Frontispiece. Cloth boards. 12s. net.

BARNABAS, HERMAS AND THE DIDACHE.

Being the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1920. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Wells. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

THEOLOGY.

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity. Edited by E. G. SELWYN, M.A. 1s. 3d. net. 15s. per annum.

Translations of Christian Literature.

THE ETHIOPIC DIDASCALIA.

Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes by J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D. 9s. net.

ST. BERNARD: CONCERNING GRACE & FREE WILL.

Addressed to William, Abbot of St. Thierry. Translated with an Introduction, Synopsis and Notes by WATKIN W. WILLIAMS, M.A. 5s.

ST. BERNARD: ST. MALACHY OF ARMAGH.

His life and other documents relating to him. By H. J. LAWLOR, D.D. 12s. net.

ST. PATRICK.

His writings and life. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6s. 6d. net.

THE LATIN AND IRISH LIVES OF CIARAN,

Called "Son of the Wright," Founder of Clonmacnois. Translated and annotated by R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, Litt.D., F.S.A. 7s. 6d.

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,

London Central Offices—6, St. MARTIN'S PLACE, W.C. 2.

Bookshops—64, NEW BOND STREET, W. 1. 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C. 4
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET. BATH: 39, GAY STREET.

And of all Booksellers.

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

John Murray · Bookseller

2 ALEXANDRA PARK GARDENS,
GLASGOW.

Telegrams : BOOKWORM, GLASGOW.

Cables : A.B.C. 5th EDITION.

I specialize in Catholic Literature (old and new), Autographs, First Editions, Editions de Luxe, and the latest Publications of the Continental Catholic publishers.
Enquiries solicited.

Catalogue No. 1 Now Ready. Post free on request.

Correspondence invited in all the principal European languages. : Agencies for foreign books desired.

CODEX IVRIS CANONICI

Editio in 18mo. *Pocket Edition.* Half parchment, 15/- ;
half morocco, 14/- ; cloth, 10/6.

Editio in 12mo. *Students' Edition.* Half parchment, 20/- ;
half morocco, 18/6 ; cloth, 15/-.

Editio in 18mo. Cum Fontium annotatione. Half
parchment, 18/- ; half morocco, 16/6 ; cloth, 13/6.

Editio in 12mo. Cum Fontium annotatione. Half
parchment, 24/- ; half morocco, 22/- ; cloth, 18/6.

Editio in 8vo. *Library Edition.* Cum Fontium annotatione.
Half parchment, 32/- ; half morocco, 28/6 ; cloth, 22/6.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE ENGLISH DOMINICANS: a History of the Province. By Very Rev. BEDE JARRETT, O.P. 8vo. Illustrated. *[In Preparation.]*

A SPIRITUAL RETREAT. Veni, Sancte Spiritus. By Very Rev. Fr. ALEXANDER, O.F.M. 8vo. 10s.

LIFE OF ST. LEONARD OF PORT MAURICE. By Fr. DOMINIC DEVAS, O.F.M. 5s.

THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK FOR 1921. New and greatly enlarged Edition. 128 pp. Wrapper, 3d.

THE MESSAGE OF FRANCIS THOMPSON. By a Sister of Notre Dame. 2s. 6d.

LIFE OF ST. NICHOLAS OF TOLENTINO, O.S.A. By Rev. E. FORAN, O.S.A. 8vo. Illustrated.

A SCOTTISH KNIGHT-ERRANT. The Story of John Ogilvie, S.J. By F. A. FORBES and M. CAHILL. 5s.

A BIBLE HISTORY. For the use of prospective and assistant teachers. Adopted by the Diocesan Religious Inspectors of Great Britain. By Rev. CHARLES HART, B.A. 3s. 6d.

THE MOTHER OF DIVINE GRACE. By Rev. STANISLAUS M. HOGAN, O.P. 6s.

THE FRINGE OF THE ETERNAL. Twelve Stories by Rev. FRANCIS GONNE. 6s.

MARRIAGE AND MOTHERHOOD. By ALICE, LADY LOVAT. 6s.

JOCK, JACK, AND THE CORPORAL. By Rev. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. Wrapper, 3s. 6d.

IN MALLOW. A Glimpse of true Irish life. By Mrs. WILLIAM O'BRIEN. Cloth, 3s. 6d. Wrapper, 2s. 6d.

THE SHIP OF PETER. By Rev. E. F. NUGENT. Illustrated by LINDSAY D. SYMINGTON. Wrapper, 1s. 6d.

THE PSALMS MADE EASY. By Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Pluvis, 3s.

ON THE MORALS OF TO-DAY. By Rev. THOMAS SLATER, S.J. Cloth, 2s. 6d. Wrapper, 1s. 3d.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHÆA. A romantic morality. By EDWARD PERCY. 8vo. Wrapper, 5s.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE SOCIAL QUESTION. By Rev. WALTER McDONALD, D.D. 7s. 6d.

"SUMMA THEOLOGIA," in English. Part I, Vols 2 and 3. Revised Editions. Part II, Vol. 3 of *Secundæ* are in the Press.

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS. By Rev. Fr. GAVAN DUFFY. Wrapper, 1s.

THE SACRED HEART AND MINE. By Sister MARY PHILIP. 3s. 6d.

THE MANUAL OF PRAYERS. Authorized by the English Hierarchy. Pulpit Edition in the "Fell" type of the Oxford Press. Pocket Edition in 32mo size.

SCRIPTURE EXAMPLES: I. THE CREED. II. THE COMMANDMENTS. By the Sisters of Notre Dame. Wrapper, 9d. each.

A SHORT METHOD OF MENTAL PRAYER. By the Most Rev. NICHOLAS RIDOLFI, Master General of the Order of Friars Preachers. Edited by Fr. DEVAS, O.P. 3s. 6d.

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL WITH COMMENTARY. By Fr. ROBERT EATON. 6s.

A DOCTRINE OF HOPE. By Bishop BONOMELLI. 3s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALITY. The History of Asceticism from the beginnings of the Church to the Middle Ages. By Dr. P. POURRAT. [*In Preparation.*]

LOVE OF THE SACRED HEART. Illustrated by St. MARGARET MARY ALACOQUE and the BLESSED JOHN EUDES. 6s.

LITTLE JESUS. By FRANCIS THOMPSON. Charminglly Illustrated. Gift Editions at 2s. 6d. and 1s. 3d.

A GUIDE TO THE MASS. A practical handbook for the use of non-Catholics at Low Mass, Missa Cantata, and High Mass. By H. F. VAUGHAN. [*In the Press.*]

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

October, November, December, 1920

LONDON

BURNS, OATES &
WASHBOURNE, Ltd.

COMMUNICATIONS in regard to articles should be addressed to the Editor of THE DUBLIN REVIEW, 28 Orchard Street, London, W. 1. Stamped addressed envelopes for reply should be enclosed. The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of proffered MSS.

Communications respecting the Publishing Department should be addressed to MESSRS. BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 28 Orchard Street, London, W. 1. Advertisements should reach the Publishers not later than the 10th of the last month of each Quarter.

CONTENTS

OCT., NOV., DEC., 1920

	PAGE
The Council of the Vatican : after Fifty Years. By Herbert Lucas, S.J.	161
The Empress Eugenie in England. By Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.	183
Disraeli : the Conclusion. By Algernon Cecil	193
Cardinal Manning and the London Strike of 1889. By Shane Leslie	219
Roman Memories of 1870. By Canon William Barry	232
The Monk's Chant. By the Hon. Evan Morgan	248
Syon Abbey 1420—1920. By J. L. Comox	249
The Centenary of Lingard's History. By Philip Hughes	259
A Roll of Honour, with Messages to the Bereaved by Cardinal Mercier and Cardinal Bourne	299

BOOKS REVIEWED :

Dr. James' *Memoir of Henry VI* ; Dr. Bosanquet's *What Religion is* ; Princess Blücher's *Berlin Diary* ; Michael Moloney's *Irish Ethno-Botany* ; Maurice Baring's *R.F.C. ; H.Q. 1914-1918* ; Hilaire Belloc's *Europe and the Faith* ; Scott Fitzgerald's *This Side of Paradise* ; *Poems* by Cecil Spring-Rice ; Colonel Repington's *First World War* ; Fr. Martindale's *St. John the Evangelist* ; M. and C. Quennell's *A History of Everyday Things in England*.

MESSRS. LONGMANS & CO.'S LIST

THE GREAT CHURCH AWAKES. Ideas and Studies concerning Unity and Reunion. By the Right Rev. EDWIN JAMES PALMER, D.D., Bishop of Bombay. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

THE PROBLEM OF REUNION. Discussed Historically in Seven Essays. By the Rev. LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J., M.A., late Senior Chaplain to the 19th Division, B.E.F., sometime Professor of Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

SISTER MARY OF ST. PHILIP (FRANCES MARY LESCHER), 1825-1904. By A SISTER OF NOTRE DAME. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. Dr. WHITESIDE, Archbishop of Liverpool. With 7 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s. net.

GOD AND THE SUPERNATURAL: A CATHOLIC STATEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Edited by the Rev. Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C., Author of "The Life of St. Francis of Assisi," etc. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]

Sir Henry Newbolt's New Book for 1920.

THE BOOK OF GOOD HUNTING. By Sir HENRY NEWBOLT. With Coloured Frontispiece and many Illustrations in Black and White by STANLEY L. WOOD. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

THE BOOK OF FAIRY POETRY. Compiled by Mrs. OWEN. With 16 Full-page Plates in Colours and 16 Illustrations in Black and White by WARWICK GOBLE. 4to. 21s. net. [Ready Shortly.]

This is an anthology designed primarily for children and also for all lovers of poetry and fairy lore. It is divided into three parts:—PART I. Fairy Stories; PART II. Fairy Songs, Dances, and Talk; PART III. Fairyland and Fairy Lore. This volume supplements and completes the Series of Fairy Books edited by Andrew Lang.

New Large-Type Edition in Two Volumes.

THE BLUE FAIRY BOOK. Edited by ANDREW LANG. With Coloured Frontispiece to each Volume and numerous other Illustrations by H. J. FORD and G. P. JACOMB HOOD. Two Volumes. Large crown 8vo., cloth gilt, gilt top. 6s. net each. [Ready Shortly.]

THE MERCHANT AT ARMS. By RONALD OAKESHOTT. With a Preface by JEFFERY FARNOL. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

STRAY-AWAYS. By E. C. SOMERVILLE and MARTIN ROSS, Authors of "The Real Charlotte," "Some Experiences of an Irish R.M." etc. With 34 Illustrations by E. C. SOMERVILLE. 8vo. 16s. net.

PILGRIMAGE. By Lord GORELL, Author of "Days of Destiny," etc. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

POEMS BY SIR CECIL ARTHUR SPRING-RICE, G.C.M.G., P.C., late British Ambassador to the United States of America. Edited by BERNARD HOLLAND, B.Litt. With an Introduction and a Photogravure Portrait. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

ROSES. Their History, Development, and Cultivation. By the Rev. JOSEPH H. PEMBERTON, Vice-President of the National Rose Society. With a Frontispiece in Colour, 9 Lithographic Plates, and other Illustrations in the Text. 8vo. Second Edition. 15s. net.

OPTICAL PROJECTION: A Treatise on the Use of the Lantern in Exhibition and Scientific Demonstration. By LEWIS WRIGHT. Fifth Edition, rewritten and brought up to date by RUSSELL S. WRIGHT, M.I.E.E. In Two Parts. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. PART I. The Projection of Lantern Slides. 4s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

The Dublin Review

OCTOBER, NOV., DECEMBER, 1920

THE COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN :

AFTER FIFTY YEARS

I

THE celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the definition of Papal Infallibility, or, to speak more accurately, of the infallible teaching authority (*magisterium*) of the Roman Pontiff, affords an opportune occasion for some reflections on the Vatican Council, of which the definition was the crowning act. And although much of what will here be said may be found in substance in Cardinal Manning's *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, and in Father Kirch's excellent article on the Council in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, the results of an independent study of the *Acta et Decreta Concilii Vaticani*, which forms the seventh volume of the *Receptionum Conciliorum Collectio Lacensis*,* of Granderath's fully documented *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*,† and in a lesser degree of other works named below,‡ may be not without interest.

At the outset it may be useful to deal, once again, with the malicious calumny, set on foot and exploited by Friedrich and other declared enemies of the Council, to

* Freiburg-i-B. 1892 (referred to as C.V.).

† Freiburg, 3 vols., 1901, 1906. The references, however, are to the French translation (5 vols., Paris, 1908), the corresponding volume and page in the German original being added in square brackets.

‡ Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vat. Konzils* (3 vols., Bonn, 1877); Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concil du Vatican* (4th edition, 2 vols, Paris, s.a.); Pfülf, *Bischof von Ketteler* (3 vols., Mainz, 1899); Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup* (3 vols., Paris, 1884); Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (2 vols., London, 1896).

The Council of the Vatican

the effect that the definition was in fact the real main purpose of its convocation.* That it might very legitimately have been called together for this purpose no Catholic, I suppose, will dispute, though the question might still arise as to the wisdom of such an intention, had it been actually entertained. But what are the facts of the case? As is well known, it was on December 6th, 1864, that Pius IX first declared, to the Cardinals who were members of the Congregation of Rites, that he proposed to assemble a General Council; but it was not till June 26th, 1867, on occasion of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter, that His Holiness made his intention known to the world at large by means of an Allocution addressed to the bishops assembled for the solemn celebration of the festival. Now neither in this Allocution nor in the Bull of Indiction issued two years later (June 29th, 1869) was there a word on the subject of Papal Infallibility. Yet it was assuredly not for lack of a suitable opportunity for speaking on the subject, had he deemed it wise to do so, that the Pope kept silence. Already, in 1865, in response to the inquiries addressed to thirty-six bishops of various nations as to the matters with which, in their judgment, the Council should deal, several had expressed their wish that the doctrine in question should be defined. Nor were reasons wanting why the definition should be regarded as opportune, and even as urgently called for, in view of the opposition to the doctrine, which from various quarters was more and more explicitly and aggressively asserting itself. Among the bishops consulted in 1865 was Mgr. Senestrey, of Ratisbon, who, in his reply, declared that the theological school of Munich had for years past been engaged in an endeavour to minimize, on alleged historical grounds, the authority of the Holy See. And this was the main purpose of two pamphlets by "A Catholic Ecclesiastic," published in Germany, entitled respectively *The Next General Council and the True Needs of the Church* (1868)

*Friedrich, ii. 3, and *passim*. Even Ollivier (l. 321), on the whole so friendly to the Council, gives expression to this conviction.

The Council of the Vatican

and *A Candid Word to the Bishops and Catholics of Germany concerning the approaching General Council* (1869). In England, Le Page Renouf's work on *The Case of Pope Honorius* (1868) was aimed directly against the doctrine of infallibility, and the announcement, in July, 1868, that Mgr. Maret, Bishop *in partibus* of Sura, Dean of the theological faculty of Paris, had in preparation a work in which he proposed to disprove the doctrine, was in the nature of an open challenge to its defenders. Nor were the latter slow to take up the challenge. Mgr. Deschamps, of Malines, entered the lists with his work, *L'Infaillibilité et le Concil Général*, which was closely followed by Archbishop Manning's pastoral, *The Ecumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*, both published in 1869. On the other side the activity of Bishop Dupanloup was untiring, but need not be here described in detail. Enough to say that, with the exception of Döllinger and his immediate circle, no one did more than he to fan the flame of controversy on the side hostile to the definition. That the desire for the definition was repeatedly and urgently expressed, not always with due regard to theological exactitude, or to the claims of charity and prudence, in the Catholic periodical press of Italy, France, and England, may be freely admitted. But no fault which could reasonably be alleged against the *Univers* or the *Civiltà Catholica* can justify writings so venomous so malicious, so mischievous, as the letters which, in March, 1869, Döllinger addressed to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg, and which, in August of the same year, he republished under the title of *The Pope and the Council* and the pseudonym of "Janus." Of the letter addressed to His Holiness by fourteen of the German bishops, assembled at Fulda in September, 1869, deprecating the definition, and of the memorials to the same effect presented by certain laymen of Coblenz and of Bonn to the bishops, respectively, of Treves and of Cologne, I must needs be content with a mere mention. But indeed enough has been said to show that long before the assembling of the Council the doctrine of papal infallibility had

The Council of the Vatican

become the subject of acrimonious discussions in more than one country of Europe, and that Pius IX must have been well aware of this. Yet he maintained his silence.

But what of those who, by the Pope's direction, were engaged in preparing the work of the Council? Was the Holy Father, perchance, concerting measures with them for the carrying into effect of his alleged purpose? It is a plain matter of history that for no previous Council had the preparations been so careful and so elaborate. But it may safely be said that rarely, in the case of any notable assembly, religious or secular, have the actual proceedings differed so widely from the programme sketched, and more than sketched, in anticipation. The theologians engaged on the task prepared no less than fifty-one *Schemata*, or draft bills as they might be called in parliamentary phrase, for discussion. One was on "Catholic doctrine," one on "the Church," one on "Christian Marriage," twenty-eight on various points of ecclesiastical discipline, eighteen on the affairs of Religious Orders, and two on "Eastern Rites" and "Catholic Missions" respectively; and in all this mass of material there was no word of papal infallibility. Such was the programme. In the event some forty-five of these *Schemata* were left untouched by the Council. Three or four were partially discussed, no conclusion being reached. Of the remaining two, the first, *De Fide Catholica* (as it was now called), was sent back to the "Deputation on Faith," to be entirely recast, and a portion of it, in its new form, was passed in the third public session of the Council (April 24th, 1870). Of the second, *De Ecclesia*, the fate was somewhat similar. The order of its chapters was inverted, a portion of it was redrafted with the addition of a section on infallibility, and this portion alone was finally passed, after protracted discussions, in the fourth and last public session (July 18th). All this being so, it would be nothing short of blind folly to imagine or to pretend that all this preparatory work, so much of which was in the event set aside, was in the nature of mere camouflage, designed to conceal the real purpose for which the

The Council of the Vatican

assembly had been, or was about to be, convoked. Nor is this all. Not only did the Preparatory Commission omit the doctrine of papal infallibility from their draft *Schema de Ecclesia*, but the official records show that its omission was by no means accidental, but was the result of a thorough discussion as to whether or no it should be included. The matter was debated at three sittings of the Commissions held on February 11th, 18th, and 25th, 1869. To the question, "Whether the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff ought to be defined as an article of faith?" the reply of all the consultors, with one exception, was that, in their judgment, the matter should not be proposed to the Council unless this should be demanded by the bishops. It is true that, on June 18th, there was a discussion about the preparation of a provisional *Schema* on infallibility, to be held in reserve in case of need, but under pressure of more urgent business the draft was left incomplete. Such was the state of things during the months which preceded the Council. And the case is strengthened by what happened during the sittings of the Council itself. For, had Pius IX been so set on the definition as his adversaries alleged, it is difficult to believe that after nearly five hundred of the assembled Fathers had, in January, 1870, urgently expressed by means of formal postulata their desire for the definition, and after further postulates had been presented, in March, to the effect that the discussion of infallibility should take precedence of all other topics, Cardinal Bilio, president of the *Deputatio de Fide*, should have so far hesitated to give effect to the last-named wish, as to have been on the point of deciding (but for the strenuous remonstrances of Manning and one or two others) that the chapters *de Primatu et Infallibili Magisterio Romani Pontificis* should await their turn, not only till eleven earlier chapters of the original draft constitution *de Ecclesia* had been dealt with, but till after a second *Schema de Fide* had been first disposed of.

Of the actual facts of the case enough has been said for my present purpose. But it seems to me to be of some

The Council of the Vatican

importance to recognize the truth, which might easily be overlooked, that, as a matter of principle and apart from considerations of prudence, it was within the competence of the Pope not merely to propose for discussion the doctrine of papal infallibility; but to set it forth authoritatively in a "dogmatic letter," similar in general character to those which his predecessors, Celestine, Leo, and Agatho, had addressed, respectively, to the Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Constantinople (IV), leaving to the assembled Fathers only the task, assuredly no superfluous one, of so drafting its decree that the dogma should receive an accurate and worthy statement. To say this is not to rely exclusively on the conciliar definition itself as retrospectively valid (which of course it is), but is to assert that papal authority in dogmatic matters had not declined between the fifth or seventh century and the nineteenth. It is strange, indeed, that, during the Council itself, appeal should have been made to the Council of Chalcedon to prove the very opposite of what its records incontestably establish; as though, forsooth, Leo's dogmatic letter had been *submitted* to the Fathers of the Council for their approval or rejection! Of the prudence of Pius IX in not proceeding by way of a "dogmatic letter" on his own infallibility, there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt. But his right or competence to issue such a document deserves to be acknowledged and explicitly affirmed.

Besides the widespread error concerning the actual intentions of Pius IX which has been already dealt with, two other misapprehensions, relative to the probable action of the Council, deserve to be mentioned; the more so because one at least of them was entertained not only by hostile critics of the Papacy but even by some few of the assembled Fathers themselves. Already, in 1867, when the bishops of the Christian world were invited to take part in the celebration of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter, even so conscientious and sober-minded a bishop as Von Ketteler of Mayence expressed to Dupanloup his fear lest this gathering should be made

The Council of the Vatican

the occasion of some premature dogmatic decree.* The wish expressed by some persons in France that the doctrine of papal infallibility should be carried "by acclamation" in the Council itself, was, with questionable prudence, made known to the general public through the *Civiltà Cattolica* of February 6th, 1869, and proved the occasion of those letters of Döllinger to the *Augsburg Gazette* of which mention has already been made. Friedrich's statement that the bishops of the Minority concerted measures to frustrate any attempt to have recourse to "acclamation" at the opening of the debates on December 28th, 1869,† finds no confirmation either in the official records or in Granderath's *History of the Council*. Nevertheless, so late as March 15th, Archbishops Kenrick (St. Louis) and Purcell (Cincinnati), with Bishops Moriarty (Kerry) and Fitzgerald (Little Rock, U.S.A.), thought it desirable to address to the Presidents of the General Congregation a letter (still preserved in the Archives, though not included in the *Acta*) in which they protested against such an attempt, about which, they said, a rumour was afloat to the effect that it would be made at the third session (April 24th). If it were made, they added, they would at once leave the Council, under protest. This communication appears to have highly amused the Cardinals, who replied, briefly rather than courteously, that none but persons devoid of good sense (*insensati*) could entertain such an idea.‡

Another fear, sedulously exploited by the enemy from outside, was lest the condemnations embodied in the Syllabus of December 8th, 1864, should be formally declared to be the infallible utterances of the Pope.§ For this fear on the part of some, for this hope on the part of

* Von Ketteler to Dupanloup (March, 1867) in Pfäff, iii. 4, and in Lagrange, iii. 119f.

† Friedrich, iii. 320.

‡ Granderath, ii. 369f. [291f.].

§ Among the questions addressed by Prince Hohenlohe, Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Court of Bavaria, to the theological faculties of the universities of Würzburg and Munich, the first is as to what is to be done should it be proposed to "raise" ("erhoben") the propositions ("Sätze") of the Syllabus to Articles of Faith (C.V. 1200).

The Council of the Vatican

others, there was at least some appearance of a foundation in fact. The suggestion had been made by many, perhaps even by the greater number of the thirty-six bishops whom, already in 1865, the Pope had consulted about the work of the Council, that the Encyclical *Quanta cura*, with the Syllabus annexed thereto, should serve as a basis for the *Schemata* to be prepared, to the end, as one bishop said, that the condemnation of various errors already issued by the Pope, or with his approval by the Roman Congregations, might be repeated, not indeed with greater force of authority but with greater solemnity. This, however, was quite a different thing from the proposal—falsely attributed to Pius IX and the *Curia*—to define as an article of faith the contradictory of each of the propositions condemned in the Syllabus. The condemnations of the Syllabus were, as Newman was to point out in his famous Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, of varying degrees of stringency, and to brand an opinion as dangerous is not to assert that it is heretical.* Moreover, seeing that many of the propositions condemned are general or universal statements (e.g., that *all* men ought to enjoy *all* sorts of liberty), and that the contradictory of a universal proposition is an indefinite particular (“some” being the contradictory of “all”), it ought to be plain that the simple process of inverting these erroneous propositions could by no means have been regarded as providing, ready-made, the materials for a series of dogmatic definitions. That the extreme view, that all the errors condemned in the Syllabus should be declared heretical, may conceivably have been held, or held for a time, by one or more members of the Council is, of course, possible; but this extreme view found, I think, no explicit expression in the course of the proceedings either of the General Congregation or of the Committee on Faith.

II

That from the very outset the members of the Council were sharply divided in opinion on the subject of papal

* *Difficulties of Anglicans*, ii. 276ff. Similarly Senestry to Tauffkirchen (Bavarian Minister to the Holy See), already in January, 1870. (C. V. 1591.)

The Council of the Vatican

infallibility, and that this division overshadowed all other interests, was the inevitable consequence of the embittered controversies on the subject which had raged in the public Press during many months before the opening session, held on December 8th, 1869. The Opposition, as we may now call them, seem to have been the first of the two parties to take steps towards systematic organization. Several national groups were first formed, out of which grew the "International Committee" of which Cardinal Manning speaks in his *Reminiscences*.* The most prominent names are those of the Archbishops of Prague and Vienna (Cardinals Rauscher and Schwartzberg), of Paris and of Kalocsa (Darboy and Haynald), and of the Bishops of Orleans, Rothenberg, Diakovar and St. Gall (Dupanloup, Hefele, Stroumeyer, and Greith). Their example was, however, quickly followed by the leading champions of infallibility, viz., the Archbishops of Westminster (Manning), Malines (Deschamps), Würzburg (Stahl), Ratisbon (Senestrey), Eichstatt (Leonrod), Paderborn (Martin), La Crosse (Haiss), Luxemburg (Adames, V.A.), Sitten or Sion in Switzerland (De Preux), Lausanne and Geneva (Marilley), and Bombay (Meurin, V.A.). Cardinal Manning, who only names a few of these (adding, however, de la Bouillerie of Carcassonne), merely tells us that they "began to meet in order to watch and counteract the French and German bishops who were united in an International Committee"†; but a diary, preserved in the Vatican archives, adds the interesting fact that the above-named prelates, already on December 23rd, 1869, met at the Villa Caserta to agree on a *Schema* or draft decree on infallibility.‡ This was to anticipate by some weeks the labours of the official *Deputatio de Fide*, as well as, probably, to forestall the activities of the "international committee" of the Opposition.

* Purcell, ii. 453. It is, however, possible that Manning somewhat exaggerated the activities of this committee. Von Ketteler, a highly credible inside witness, writes, on March 5th, 1870: "Nichts ist unwahrer und lügenhafter als wenn dieser Versammlung ein principiellcs Opposition —und Partei—programm von der betreffenden Presse jetzt Octroirt Wird." (Pfülf, iii. 61.)

† Purcell, i.c. ‡ C.V. 1696.

The Council of the Vatican

So far, good ; for it was but natural that two bodies of men, each persuaded of the merits and urgency of their cause, should concert measures for the attainment of their respective aims by all legitimate means. That some of the means employed by certain members of the Minority were not legitimate, and that, on the other hand, the policy adopted by the more active members of the Majority was not, perhaps, in every instance wise, will presently appear. Meanwhile a word may usefully be said by way of apology for the Opposition. At this distance of time, and in the light of official documents and contemporary records which have been published in the interval, it ought to be possible, and is surely desirable, to arrive at a more just, charitable, and truthful estimate of the character and conduct of the prelates who have been named, and of their very able but independent ally Bishop von Ketteler, than it was easy to form in the heat or on the morrow of the conflict. In spite of all their mistakes in theory and in action, it is difficult, in view of the services rendered to the Church by such men as Rauscher, Schwartzenberg, Greith and Von Ketteler, and even by Dupanloup and Haynald (afterwards, like Newman, created a Cardinal by Leo XIII), to imagine that in their very determined opposition to the definition they acted, in the main, from other than worthy motives. Their fears of the evils that would follow the definition, of the falling away of Catholics, of the alienation of heretics, schismatics and unbelievers, who might otherwise have been converted, of the offence that would be given—with deplorable results—to the civil governments of Europe, and again their indignation at the attacks made upon their own orthodoxy and loyalty to the Church, and at the unwisdom (as Newman also deemed it) of disturbing the peace of consciences by an uncalled-for dogmatic decree, to be passed—so it was alleged—at the behest of busybodies who did not understand the true state of the question, and who presumed to dictate to their pastors and to the Holy Father himself how the Church should be governed—these fears, it is impossible

The Council of the Vatican

to doubt, were genuinely entertained, and this indignation no less genuinely felt by those who gave expression to them in the Council. Newman's confidential letter to Bishop Ullathorne (betrayed to the Press like so many other documents which should have been safeguarded by the conciliar oath of secrecy), in which he speaks of "an insolent and aggressive faction" as engaged in the work of agitating for the definition, finds a resounding echo in these words of Darboy :

De l'infaillibilité il n'avait été question ni dans la bulle de convocation ni dans aucun des actes de la convocation. Et c'était à bon droit, car le monde catholique ne désirait pas et n'avait aucune raison de désirer qu'on portât devant le concile cette question demeurée libre. Le pape avait, dans son zèle des âmes, estimé que d'autres mana appelaient l'attention du concile d'une façon plus pressante. Contrairement à toutes les coutumes traditionnelles de l'Eglise, contrairement aux droits de la hiérarchie et aux convenances, c'étaient des prêtres, voire des laïques, étrangers au concile, qui avaient renlevé le débat. Cette poussée démocratique avait prorogé une telle agitation qu'elle avait troublé la conscience de nombre des Pères : ils craignirent de ne plus pouvoir rentrer dans leurs diocèses ou de ne plus les gouverner qu'à grande peine s'ils s'opposaient à la définition . . . Il reste que le tumulte déplorable fait aux portes du concile a porté atteinte à notre liberté et à notre dignité.*

That the Minority were quite woefully mistaken is not here disputed ; and the passage which has just been quoted may serve to illustrate the blindness to which even well-meaning and able men are liable when engaged in the impassioned defence of a cause which they have at heart. The speaker, in this instance, is blind to the plain fact that the movement in favour of the definition in his own country was by no means confined to writers, whether lay or ecclesiastical, in the periodical Press, but found expression in very numerous petitions addressed, quite constitutionally, either to the Holy Father himself or to

* Speech delivered in the 55th General Congregation (Granderath, iv. 234 [iii. 234]) from the official shorthand report. Another version, substantially identical, in Ollivier, ii. 285f.

The Council of the Vatican

the bishops for transmission to him.* He is blind to the malicious, mendacious, and savage attacks on the part of Döllinger and his school, of which the Pope and the Council and the proposed definition had been and were still being made the object. And his blindness on this point is the more significant because it was precisely these attacks which of themselves would have been sufficient—in view of their persistence and widespread publicity—to render the definition not merely opportune but almost imperatively necessary, even had it not been so on the mistaken hypothesis that men's consciences were really at rest upon the matter, and ought not to be disturbed. This argument had already been urged in the "Reasons" annexed to the great *postulatum* of December 28th, 1869, in favour of the definition.† It was to be very explicitly urged by the Bishop of Concepcion, in Chile (Salas), in the fifty-eighth General Congregation. If the Council, he said, were now to refrain from the definition, it would be enacting the lamentable part of Pope Honorius; words which throw light on Manning's somewhat cryptic utterance about "a plain conspiracy to make Pius IX the Honorius of the Nineteenth Century."‡ Indeed, so evident was it that the outside opposition had unwittingly played into the hands of those whom they attacked, that Friedrich can unblushingly suggest that the "papal" party deliberately provoked the opposition.§ Lastly, but by no means least, Darboy was strangely blind to his own inconsistency, in complaining of outside pressure at the

* No less than twenty-seven closely printed columns of *C.V.* (1644-71) are filled with such petitions, either printed *in extenso* or more often in brief abstracts, with an indication, in each case, of the number and quality of the signatories. It is probable that, even apart from strictly theological considerations, the "inferior clergy" of France saw, in the fuller recognition of the plenitude of the papal authority, a means of defence against the somewhat autocratic methods of government adopted by certain of the bishops. (Cf. Ollivier, i. 282ff., ii. 29, 206; G., ii. 365f. [273].)

† "Quo evidentius . . . catholica veritas pradicabatur, eo vehementius, tam libellis quam ephemeridibus nuperrime impugnata est . . . Quare, si antea de opportunitate istius doctrinæ in hoc Œcumenico Concilio pronuntiandæ a pluribus dubitari adhuc potuit, nunc eam definire necessarium prorsus videtur." (*C.V.* 931f.)

‡ Granderath, iv. 232 [iii. 231]; Manning's "Reminiscences" in *Purcell*, ii. 454.

§ Friedrich, ii. 6.

The Council of the Vatican

very time when he and others were sparing no effort to enlist the help of the Emperor Napoleon and his government on behalf of the Minority: efforts which were happily frustrated by the political good sense and, in a measure, the Catholic instincts of Emil Ollivier, the trusted minister of Napoleon.

This last point deserves to be driven home by the recital of indisputable facts, culled from the published diplomatic correspondence of the time. Here is a brief calendar of the relevant documents which are available.*

1. *Darboy to Napoleon*, 26th Jan. Liberty in the Council is greatly limited. A petition for the definition of infallibility has been signed by some hundreds. A draft constitution *de Ecclesia* in 21 chapters has been distributed. "La tendance en paraît excessive." Evil results are to be feared. "Je me demande si l'intérêt général, l'intérêt de la société religieuse et civile, n'exige pas qu'on nous vienne en aide." Would it not be well to make it known to the public that certain proceedings of the Council "ne sont pas absolument satisfaisantes?"

2. Jan. s.d. Ollivier reports a conversation with the Archbishop of Algiers (Lavigerie). The latter says the definition is inevitable. It is useless to oppose it. "Moderate" bishops will be well advised to direct their efforts "à mitiger les termes de la définition."

3. *Ollivier to one of the Minority* who has written "au nom d'un groupe de la minorité," 15th March. He admires "le courage, la science, la fermeté de votre minorité" but doubts whether any diplomatic intervention would be useful. It would have the effect of rousing indignation. "Tout le parti ultramontain ne se lèverait-il pas comme une légion?"

4. *Forcade* (Bishop of Nevers) *to Ollivier*, 7th April. He has notified the Pope of the demand about to be made that a Memorandum from the French Government be read in the Council. The Pope has replied that he is most desirous of not giving any offence to the Emperor. "Il me paraît cependant que Sa Sainteté ne finisse par céder à la passion des ardents qui ne lui laissent ni paix ni trêve, si elle ne se sent habituellement soutenue par une main qui lui inspire confiance." The return of Banneville (the French ambassador) to Rome is therefore much to be desired.

5. *Darboy to Napoleon*, 2nd May. He has feared to write,

* They are given by Ollivier, li. 91, 96, 132, 214, 236ff., and in C. V. 1546ff.

The Council of the Vatican

lately, lest he should seem to be suggesting to the government the adoption "des mesures qu'il ne voudrait pas pousser jusqu'au bout"; for the question now is how to give an effective sanction ("de sanctionner efficacement") to the communications made to the Court of Rome.

6. *Same to same*, 21st May. Recommends, for the Emperor's information, an article from the *Monde* of 14th February, and also the pamphlet *Ce qui se passe au Concile*. [This is one of two brochures which were publicly reprobated by nearly all who were present at the close of the 85th General Congregation, on 13th July.] To the memorandum of 20th February the Pope has replied by introducing the *Schema* on infallibility. To the second memorandum recently presented by Banneville he has replied "en mettant à l'ordre du jour la délibération sur le *Schema*." The writer suggests, as a step towards a more determined policy, the recall of Banneville.

7. *Ollivier to Darboy*, 11th June. The Emperor has shown him Darboy's last letter. We cannot recall Banneville, as this would entail the withdrawal of the French troops, "ce qui aurait l'inconvénient de mêler une question d'ordre purement politique à un débat dogmatique." If the Bishops had addressed us officially, we should have been justified in concerning ourselves with their affairs; but we have received only "des communications mystérieuses et individuelles"; officially we are ignorant of the course of your debates. During years past the chief effort of the French episcopate has been to separate itself from the State, to put everything into the hands of the Pope; and now that the Papacy, with whose aid we have been disarmed, strives to impose its will upon them ("le subordonner"), what is there that we could do? All our weapons, organic laws and ancient customs, are broken in our hands. "Notre seul arme serait le persécution, ce dont Dieu nous garde!"

That such underhand dealings with the civil government were inconsistent, not only with Darboy's professed abhorrence of outside influence, but with loyalty to the Church, will not be disputed, even though we refrain from imputing to the Archbishop any consciously sinister motive. And it would seem from No. 3 of the items given above, that he was not alone in his desire to secure for his party the help of the French ministry. In this respect the German and Hungarian bishops have a better record.

The Council of the Vatican

So far as the testimony of published correspondence goes, the Prince-Bishop of Breslau (Förster) enjoyed the unenviable distinction of having been the only one of them who, on one occasion at least, committed what—to use the mildest term—must be called a deplorable indiscretion. In a letter dated July 1st, 1870, Count Arnim, Prussian ambassador to the Holy See, reports to his royal master two or more interviews which he has had with Förster, who admitted that the governments of Europe, and of Prussia in particular, were fully justified in being on their guard against those “Roman tendencies” which after the Council would declare themselves (“*sich geltend machen*”) than hitherto. It might be necessary to withdraw all German ecclesiastical students from Rome, a measure which would give him no concern at all, and would be of small consequence when compared with the difficulties which would arise at home.*

Even more blameworthy in itself, whatever excuse may be made for it on the score of motive, was the conduct of those bishops, whether French or German, who not only continued to maintain friendly relations with the declared enemies of the Council, but in one way or another helped them by their countenance or encouragement. There is no need to mention names, or to enter into details on this disagreeable topic.

A charge of a more general nature, which has repeatedly been made against the Minority as a body, is that of having endeavoured to fend off the definition by means of obstructive tactics within the Council itself. That this charge does not lack foundation may be readily conceded. Friedrich quotes a private memorandum drawn up by Hefele in which he recommends that every member of the Opposition should claim to be heard on some particular aspect of the question. And it is plain that if this programme had been carried out, prorogation would have become necessary long before the definition could have

* C.V. 1609. Allowance must of course be made for the circumstance that we only have Arnim's report of this conversation. Arnim had been persistently but fruitlessly worrying Bismarck to intervene. (C.V. 1597ff.)

The Council of the Vatican

been reached.* It is well to remember, however, that the obstructive tactics employed in large measure took the perfectly constitutional form of *postulata*, addressed either to the Holy Father or to the Presidents of the Congregation. Nor can men who conscientiously believed that the definition was for one reason or another undesirable, and who hoped that Providence would somehow intervene to prevent it from being passed, be severely blamed for taking the natural means to bring about this end. It is to be observed, moreover, that in the course of the final debate on the fourth chapter of the Constitution *de Ecclesia*, which extended from the seventy-second General Congregation to the eighty-fourth, out of fifty-seven speakers no less than thirty-seven were of the Majority and only eighteen of the Minority, two (Whelan and Legat) deserving to be classed as doubtful. And it is plainly evident from the official records that the Bishops of the Opposition enjoyed no monopoly of prolixity and irrelevance. Among the speakers in favour of the definition, two (Valerga and Spaccapietra) were called to order, two (Aggabarti and Nulty) were requested to stop, and the speeches of three others (Ballerini, Paya y Rico, and Martinez) are described as unduly prolix. Of the Minority, one (Losanna) was called to order, and another (Vérot) is said to have made a bad impression by a discourse "d'une longueur démesurée."†

Of the grievances of the Opposition, with one exception, space will not allow me to speak. In this one case their complaints seem to me to have been not altogether devoid of foundation. Seeing that the Holy Father had not thought fit to proceed by way of a dogmatic letter, but had given to the Council the status of a freely deliberative assembly, it was of real importance to avoid even the appearance of weighting the scales on the side of the Majority. And this not only in the sessions of the General Congregation, where certainly the utmost measure of freedom was allowed to the speakers on either side, but also in that inner circle in which was carried on

* Granderath, iv. 66w. [iii. 435w.] † Granderath, v. 1ff. [iii. 385ff.].

The Council of the Vatican

the very important business of drafting the *Schemata, de Fide* and *de Ecclesia*, and, in due course, of considering the amendments proposed. Now what actually happened was this, that, in opposition as it would seem to more prudent counsels, the self-constituted representatives of the Majority drew up a list of prelates whom they deemed suitable for membership of the *Deputatio de Fide*, and, with one possible exception, carried their list at the election; so that on this most important committee the Minority had barely one representative, Simor, the Primate Archbishop of Gran.* It is at least possible that if, for instance, Von Ketteler and Hefele, and possibly Haynald, had been given a place on this committee, they would have rendered valuable services, much time would have been saved, and much bitterness avoided.†

A point of greater importance in the interests of historical truth is the correction of a mistaken impression which has been very widely spread, to the effect that the Bishops of the Minority were, as a body, opposed, not to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility itself, but solely to its opportuneness. The mistake would seem to have arisen from the fact that although sundry members of the Minority professed, in terms, their belief in Papal Infallibility, they made it very clear that they did not accept the doctrine *in the sense of the Schema*. They insisted on conditions and limitations which it was the very purpose of the definition to exclude. Of course the topic of inopportuneness loomed large in the general debate on the *Schema* as a whole; and much was made of the fears, already mentioned, lest the faith of weak-kneed Catholics should be alienated, and heretics and schismatics repelled from the Church, and lest, in consequence of the

* Friedrich (iii. 166f.) alleges that the Pope himself, Cardinal Corsi, and Archbishop Valerga, were opposed to the exclusiveness of the list, and that its adoption was due to the energy of Archbishop Manning. Friedrich is, of course, quite untrustworthy as to details. But a substratum of truth probably underlies his narrative here. Cf. G., i. 92 [73].

† Von Ketteler was perhaps the most highly respected member of the Opposition. Hefele's services on the preparatory commission had been most valuable (G., i. 468, 481ff. [392, 402ff.]; C.V. 1087ff.). Haynald's skill in the drafting of Latin documents was universally acknowledged.

The Council of the Vatican

definition the Church should become embroiled with the governments of Europe. But even in the general debate this was by no means the only aspect of the subject that was touched upon. And in the special debate on the fourth chapter of the *Schema*, not only were the Fathers admonished at the commencement of successive sessions, that the question of opportuneness was now out of order and must not again be raised, but with barely one or two exceptions the admonition was obeyed. The following minute or précis (1) of the speeches of some of the Minority bishops in the former of these two debates, and (2) of all the opposition speeches in the latter, will serve to make the truth of the assertions which have just been made abundantly clear :

A.—*The Debate on the Schema in General.**

1. Greith is of opinion that the doctrine is not solidly established. We are all agreed that the Pope is infallible when he exercises his authority in union with the Church. Grave historical difficulties must first be examined. 2. Hefele, after speaking warmly on the question of opportuneness, cites as arguments against infallibility the Council of Chalcedon, the case of Honorius, etc., and argues that, if the doctrine were true, Councils would be superfluous. 3. Vérot declares that, for him, it would be a "sacrilege" to accept the *Schema*. (He is called to order amid marked signs of disapprobation.) 4. Las Cases avers that the proposed decree would "alter the constitution of the Church." 5. Connolly says the texts do not prove infallibility in the sense of the proposed definition. 6. Strossmayer argues from the case of St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, and insists that we must not proceed on vague traditions of doubtful meaning. 7. Maret is, of course, frankly Gallican. He argues that the promises made to St. Peter are fulfilled if the Pope has the means, by consulting the Church, of preserving himself from error. 8. Dinkel uses the same argument. 9. Von Ketteler urges that the texts do not prove the doctrine of the proposed decree unless they establish the Pope's inerrancy apart from the Church.

B.—*The Debate on the Fourth Chapter.*†

1. Mathieu is chiefly concerned to rebut charges against the

* These speeches are reported in Granderath, iv. 162ff. [iii. 162ff.].

† This debate is reported in Granderath, iv. 394ff., v. 7ff. [iii. 376ff.].

The Council of the Vatican

Church in France, alleged to have been made by Valerga. 2. Rauscher cannot admit the doctrine "*telle qu'elle est présentée dans le chapitre.*" A moral certainty that the Pope does not err is sufficient for the faithful. The conciliar decrees cited do not prove the point. 3. Guidi "has always taught the doctrine, subject, however, to the condition of the previous consent of the Church." 4. MacHale, speaking as a witness, says the doctrine has not been clearly held in Ireland. 5. Errington would like to have the matter discussed by experts in Committee. 6. Connolly holds that the scriptural and conciliar texts have no force. 7. Landriot doubts whether the opinion is so certain as to admit of being defined as an article of faith. 8. Losanna thinks the doctrine cannot be proved with sufficient clearness from revealed (?) texts. 9. Ketteler declares infallibility to be the doctrine of a school, and protests against its elevation into a dogma. It separates the head from the members; therefore it is false. 10. Ginouhliac would define the doctrine as taught (he says) by St. Antoninus (i.e., the Pope infallible with the help of the Bishops).* 11. Moriarty insists on the absence of certitude. 12. Vérot in a very long speech adds nothing new. 13. Colet is briefly and obscurely reported. 14. Maret is for St. Antoninus' (alleged) doctrine. 15. David. All the struggles of the Church against heresy would have been superfluous had the Pope been infallible. 16. Greith is for St. Antoninus. 17. Meignan thinks proofs insufficient, proposes the formula of St. Antoninus. 18. Ramadié to the same effect.

If the question be now asked how the members of the Minority came to hold opinions, not always in agreement with one another, but all opposed to the definition, the answer, so far as it can be given at all, will differ somewhat for the bishops of different nationalities. The French bishops of the Opposition were undoubtedly swayed by a mistaken form of patriotism which made them jealous of any imputation against the orthodoxy of their Gallican forbears. This appeared when Valerga's comparison of the Gallicans with the Monothelites (strongly resembling

* The words of St. Antoninus so often referred to in these debates are: "*Papa utens concilio et requirens adjutorium universalis Ecclesiac . . . errare non potest.*" It was rightly argued on the other side that these words are not exclusive of personal infallibility, but rather descriptive of the means ordinarily (but not necessarily) adopted by the Popes in order to arrive at the truth.

The Council of the Vatican

Newman's parallel between Monothelites and Anglicans) aroused no little indignation.* And their indebtedness for their appointments to the goodwill of the civil government predisposed some of them to seek aid in that quarter, as has been seen, in defence of what they conceived to be their legitimate "liberties," against what they deemed to be the encroachments of the papacy.† In Germany the authority and influence, based on their undoubted learning, of a school of University professors of whom it may be said that they were more successful in collecting facts than skilful in drawing true inferences therefrom, had imposed itself on the minds of prelates who, with few exceptions, had not themselves been profound students of theology. And their princely or all but princely rank, their wealth, the vastness of their dioceses, may have predisposed them to magnify the episcopal office (as held by themselves) and to look with something approaching to contempt on the multitudes of Italian prelates with their limited jurisdiction and comparative poverty, and on those still poorer brethren the Vicars-Apostolic from remote lands. Of the relatively small number of English, Irish and American members of the Opposition, so far as they were not merely inopportunists, it can only be said that in one way or other they had come under Gallican influences.

As to the fears expressed concerning probable defection from the Church as the result of the definition, these it must be confessed were to a considerable extent realized in the case of the "old Catholic" schism and heresy. On this subject I cannot do better than quote the words of Cardinal Manning:

Those who were most firm in urging . . . the definition were not unconscious of the danger. They remembered that after Nicæa eighty bishops separated from the unity of the Church, and carried multitudes with them. Nevertheless, the fathers of the Nicene Council did not forsake or compromise the truth, nor think it inopportune to declare it. Athanasius was reproached for dividing the Christian world for an iota. But

* Granderath, iv. 281ff., 363, 398ff. [iii. 277ff., 349, 379ff.].

† Cf. Ollivier, ii. 261. He is speaking of a time anterior by more than a century to the Council. But ideas and ideals are long-lived.

The Council of the Vatican

that iota has, under God, saved the faith of the ever-blessed Trinity. The faith of the Christian world rests at this day upon the definition of Nicæa.—So again, after the Council of Ephesus, thirty bishops followed the Nestorian heresy. The fathers of that Council foresaw the danger, but they knew that no danger was to be compared with the danger of betraying the truth. They defined the doctrine of faith as to the unity of the One Person in two natures, and on that definition the doctrine of the Incarnation has rested immutably to this day.*

And who can doubt that the definition of papal infallibility has strengthened the hands of the Church in her conflict with Modernism?

If possible or prospective converts have been repelled or kept back from submission to the Church during the fifty years which have elapsed since the prorogation of the Council, it is safe to say that this has been due far less to the definition itself, as soberly explained by, for instance, Bishop Fessler and Cardinal Newman, than to the distorted versions of the doctrine freely exploited by its enemies, and, in a measure, to the exaggerated views of over-ardent Catholic writers. But to these last it may fairly be said that the *quietus* has been given by the definition itself, by the comments of Fessler and Newman, and of others who have followed in their wake, and last, but not least, by the plain declaration of the new Code of Canon Law, that "nothing is to be taken (*intelligitur*) as dogmatically declared or defined unless it is plain that such is the case (*nisi id manifeste constiterit*)."[†]

That the definition was, after all, highly opportune is not, of course, an article of faith, any more than it is an article of faith that the fathers at Ephesus acted wisely in issuing no formal definition of the doctrine concerning the Incarnation.‡ But on the assumption of its oppor-

* *The True History*, pp. 200.

† It may be well to give the Canon in full. "Can. 1323, § 1. Fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt quæ verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur et ab Ecclesia sive sollemni iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur. § 2. Sollemne iudicium pronuntiare proprium est tum Œcumenici Concilii tum Romani Pontificis ex cathedra loquentis. § 3. *Declarata seu definita dogmaticæ res nulla intelligitur, nisi id manifeste constiterit*" (italics mine).

‡ Had they done so, the error of Eutyches might have been forestalled and the Council of Chalcedon rendered needless.

The Council of the Vatican

tuneness it is impossible not to see the finger of God's Providence in the fact that it was passed and confirmed by the Pope on the very day before the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War made the prorogation of the Council necessary and its re-assembly impossible.

HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

THE EMPRESS EUGENIE IN ENGLAND

THE Empress lived in England from 1870 to 1920. These fifty years of change and revolution were years of retirement and retreat for her, the heaviest, but the most fruitful years of her life. Then it was that she revealed herself to those who had only known her superficially. In spite of all the more or less authentic confidences about the Empress, her true history has not been written and her character is still little known. Thrown suddenly, like the Empress Josephine, without a noviciate into imperial ceremony and convention, she had maintained an attitude ; but how different she became in her solitude to the image conceived by those who only knew the Empress of the French in terms of hate !

Her three regencies revealed the strength of a character which could not be surprised and was honoured by even her enemies. The fall of the Empire, the death of her husband and the tragic end of the son of her hopes, gave her that indefinable sense of achievement, which misfortune adds to virtue. (*"Ce je ne sais quoi d'achevé que les malheurs ajoutent aux grandes vertus."*—Bossuet.) Histories, as a rule, only mention two regencies, but she took the reins of government three times ; in 1859 during the war with Austria, in 1865 while the Emperor was in Algeria, and in 1870. Her fifty years in England come under three periods, Hastings, Chislehurst and Farnborough. The few days at Hastings were of capital importance. On September 7th, 1870, the Empress left France on the "Gazelle" yacht of Sir John Burgoyne and reached Hastings after a night of gale. We need only emphasize the reserve and dignity maintained by the Empress in the affair of Regnier. She repelled the adventurer and allowed Persigny and Rouher, the chiefs of the Bonapartist party, to conduct their intrigues without consenting to take a part herself. She declared she would do nothing to fetter the efforts of the National Defence.

Empress Eugenie in England

She assured General Bourbaki, Bazaine's delegate, that she would refuse the Prussian advances to re-establish the Empire. "France must come before the dynasty." She refused with the same energy to go to Metz with her son or to launch a manifesto, saying to General Boyer, "You cannot doubt the ardent patriotism which causes me to efface myself and reserve my rights till peace is concluded. I wish to save the last Army of Order even at the price of all my hopes." She begged Lord Granville to inform the French delegation that at no price would she abuse English hospitality to give herself to the appearance of an intrigue. Granville transmitted this to M. de Chaudordy, who charged the French representative in London, Tissot, to thank her for her patriotic attitude.

She tried to influence an armistice or intervention in favour of France, and wrote to the Emperor of Austria saying, "My sole preoccupation is France and for her alone my deeply tried heart is pleading." But Francis Joseph withdrew into his neutrality and she wrote to Bismarck on October 22nd, to obtain an armistice in favour of Metz, and addressed Bernstorff, the Prussian Ambassador in London, but unsuccessfully. After the capitulation of Metz the Empress wrote to Boyer: "Broken by grief I can only express my admiration for this valiant army and its chiefs. You know my efforts to prevent a fate which I would have spared them at the price of my dearest hopes." Rothan resumes her attitude in the lines, "She had no pre-occupation except to make the sympathies her lot roused in all the courts of Europe serve the cause of France." In 1918, again, when the French Government was preoccupied in establishing the responsibilities in Alsace-Lorraine, it did not hesitate to ask the Empress for the letter written by William I in September, 1870, offering peace at the price of an indemnity and a narrow strip of territory, without exacting Alsace or Lorraine. She hastened to send the original. The French Ambassador in London sent the writer to present her with a letter of thanks from the French Government. She opened it in his presence and deci-

Empress Eugenie in England

pered it not without difficulty, owing to her enfeebled sight. Unable to read the signature, she handed it to the intermediary. It was the signature of George Clemenceau ! The Empress could not prevent a smile. Would she have ever expected Clemenceau to write her a letter of amiable thanks ? Other incidents have been recorded of her and Clemenceau, but this at least was authentic.

The Empress left Hastings for a modest villa at Chislehurst where she remained till she purchased the property at Farnborough Hill in 1881. The Empire which fell at Sedan was judged and condemned too summarily not to produce a reaction. The most faithful friends of the Empire felt that a restoration was impossible with Napoleon III, but after his death, January 9th, 1873, they thought of his son. The work of Auguste Filon will remain a monument to his memory from a tutor who knew how to speak with conscience, talent and emotion. The qualities he describes make all the bitterer the memory of his death in the Zululand expedition where Destiny seems to have fallen upon him. When he announced his intention to fight in Zululand she opposed him with all her energy. But the Prince had become a man and showed a will of iron. On a morning of February the Prince went to the Church of St. Mary at Chislehurst where he received Communion with his friend Tristan Lambert. The Empress accompanied him to Southampton where he embarked on the "Danube" after being toasted at a banquet by English officers. The wave of her hand from the window of a Southampton hotel was the mother's last good-bye. On June 1st, 1879, his company was surprised in the bush, and left behind by his comrades, he fought alone by the side of the River Embarzani and fell under the assegais against the odds. Only on the 19th the news of his death reached England, as unexpected as it was appalling. It was a more terrible blow for the Empress than the fall of the Empire or the death of the Emperor. It was the unhealing wound which she carried to her grave. For long years she avoided even a distant reference to it, and she only broke silence

Empress Eugenie in England

a few days later to recommend mercy for the officer, who had deserted him, at his court martial. She said: "My only source of consolation is drawn from the idea that my beloved child has fallen as a soldier obeying his orders, and that those who gave them believed he was capable and useful. Enough of recrimination. Let the memory of his death reunite in a common regret all who loved him and let no one suffer for his reputation or interests. I demand it as the last prayer of one who can desire no more upon earth."

From the day that she learnt of his death, the Empress resolved to visit the place where he was fallen, and the next year she accomplished her project. In a letter to Pietri (January 3rd, 1880), she explained herself: "I feel myself drawn toward this place of pilgrimage by the same power that the disciples of Christ felt for the Holy Places. The idea of seeing and passing through the last stages of my beloved child's life, of finding myself on the spots wheron fell his last looks, and in the same season, and of passing the night of June 1st watching and praying over his memory is a need to my soul and an end in my life. Since the conclusion of the war allows me to contemplate the chance of its success, it has become my dominating thought. This idea sustains and raises my courage. Without it I would have no power of reaction and I would let myself wear away to sorrow. I have no illusions. I know the griefs which await me there, the long and painful journey, the weariness of so rapid a voyage, but all would disappear before Itelezi."

She accomplished this sad journey accompanied by several friends. No fatigue threw her back and no trial was spared to her. The pacified Zulus, who had unwittingly killed her son, thought they were honouring her and showing their admiration for the young white chief fallen under their assegais by coming before her in battle-order and performing their terrible fantasias. The evening of June 1st, 1880, saw her in prayer in the fatal donga on the very spot where he fell. She passed the night there. Faithful ones have described how she

Empress Eugenie in England

walked as under a hallucination, and was really conscious of his presence and that he was speaking to her. On returning to England she decided to make a tomb worthy of the Emperor and the Prince Imperial.

With the aid of the French architect Destailleurs, the Empress erected a church in flamboyant gothic, which shows its inspiration from the Church of Ferté-Bernard in Sarthe. The cupola, which was added at her request, is not in the purity of the style, but it recalls the dome of the Invalides and the souvenir of the first Napoleon. The crypt was to become the tomb of the last Napoleons. There, on January 9th, 1888, the remains of Napoleon III and the Prince Imperial were transferred from Chislehurst. There the Empress rejoined them on July 18th, 1888. Here the Empress summoned the Premonstratensians, who afterwards went to Storrington and were replaced by French Benedictines of Solesmes, and in 1903 the Priory was erected into an Abbey. As for the account of her difficulties with the religious actually and falsely published in *La Nation Belge* at the time of her death, those who knew her intimately knew that she carried her reserve towards the Abbey to the extent that she never dreamed of even using her prerogatives in the double rôle of Foundress and Empress. As long as her health permitted she assisted at the Sunday High Mass. Later she heard Mass in the chapel of her residence. From the outbreak of the war the monks offered the Government a house and the Empress offered a wing of the castle for the wounded. The wounded became her great pre-occupation during the war, which was the last great trial of the Empress, for it recalled the terrible year of 1870. Certain books have made the Empress responsible for the war of 1870, but a careful study of the two wars shows that the preparations were not dissimilar. The Empress did not make the war of 1870 and she did not call it "*ma guerre*"! She followed the recent war with anguish in all its peripeteias. She devoted what remained of her failing eyesight to the passionate reading of the newspapers. At the armistice of November 11th,

Empress Eugenie in England

1918, I can quote her words: "*Depuis 1870 c'est ma première joie.*" It was the first great joy since the fatal year and made her forget the inconsolable grief she had always carried with her.

Nevertheless, the Empress must not be represented as too desolate and unhappy. She knew how to carry her grief unto herself. In conversation she had a quick sense of the ridiculous and a comic situation aroused her gaiety without malice. She shrank from the solemnity of some visitors. The passer by could not understand how easily she bore the weight of her misfortunes. A strength of character and a certain modesty thrust them into the depths of her heart. Those who know the detail of her life know that after her son's death she passed months without sleeping.

Sometimes a chance word in conversation recalled the Empress's sense of human ingratitude, but it would be quickly tempered by a feeling of general indulgence. Reading was her great passion, but novels seldom appeared on her table. To politics, however, she turned the most readily.

When she had assisted at the Council of Ministers, she often surprised her hearers by her judgment and penetration. "The Empress is one of the great politicians of our time," wrote an eminent man, who was no friend of hers. It was this unsleeping curiosity which set her reading and travelling. Her yacht carried her to Norway and Sweden and all the Mediterranean, to the Black Sea and as far as Ceylon. She sought peace and she would have emigrated to another planet if it had been possible to escape the sad obsessions of memory and the littlenesses of the earth. The voyages saved her the plague of her correspondence. Every morning a flood of letters from all over France and the whole world implored her charity or influence, and one person was exclusively occupied in attending to the charities of the Empress.

Her Catholic faith was sincere and her loyalty to the Church entire. Besides the habitual devotion of all Catholic hearts the Empress was not intimate with Catho-

Empress Eugenie in England

lic Bishops. Men like Beyle, Mérimée, Lavisse and Filon would not pass for clericals and their influence on her would be in the opposite direction. She did not believe that the clergy were seriously the better for entering politics. She did not think the union of Church and State desirable unless they remained in their own spheres. Her ideas and perhaps her inspiration can be traced in the letter which the Prince Imperial wrote to Tristan Lambert after a visit to Pius IX (January 5th, 1877): "... I did not go to see the Holy Father for a political end. I did not go to request the support of French Catholics, but I went to leave my homage at the feet of a saintly old man. I assured the Holy Father that the Third Empire, like the Second and the First, would be the Protector of all useful liberties and especially of those which help the good. But I let him understand that I considered the Church ought to remain rather outside political struggles and join no party under pain of losing influence and prestige. And the thought I dared express was so identical to his that he answered a royalist one day, who spoke to him of the white flag, 'No sir, we men of God have no flag save the Cross of Christ.' The reception I had from my Godfather was most sympathetic. He left me with these words, 'I hope for your speedy return to France, I desire it for the Church and the Fatherland, for when France is at peace calm reigns in the world, but when she is agitated by revolutionary passions there is a menace to the world's security.'"

Before the birth of the Prince Imperial Pius IX sent the Golden Rose to the Empress for her services to the Church. She carried this precious souvenir with her from Paris and gave it a few months before her death to Farnborough Abbey. On that occasion she remarked that the Golden Rose had not brought happiness to crowned heads, and she named the sovereigns who have received it in the last century: Queen Isabella of Spain, the Empress of Austria, the Queen of Naples, the Queen Isabella of Portugal and, to close the sad procession, herself! Another more precious relic was that of the True Cross once belong-

Empress Eugenie in England

ing to Charlemagne. It was given by the Canons of Aix-la-Chapelle to the Empress Josephine to remain in the family of Queen Hortense. Napoleon III gave it into the jealous care of the Empress. This relic, called the Talisman of Charlemagne, was enclosed in a magnificent reliquary. The bombardment of Rheims Cathedral gave her the idea of giving this precious souvenir to the martyred Cathedral. The present writer was charged to bring the relic to the Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims and thus a marvellous jewel of mediæval art returned to France. The Talisman is well known to archæologists. Napoleon III allowed a German savant to study it in 1869. Several German attempts were made to recover it, but in vain. Partly to discourage all these attempts the Empress gave it to the treasury of Rheims. Thus one of the last thoughts of the Empress was symbolized in the Cathedral of Rheims, which contains an abbreviation of her history and glories. By an inspiration as lofty as touching, she wished the relic which she had so greatly valued to return to the land of her adoption, that she might pay in part the ransom of what that land had undergone under the assault of the Saxon.

The character of the Empress was such that no man could or ever did influence it, not even the Emperor, and certainly not the Jesuits of the Protestant legend. In face of the legend she remained silent with the strength of fifty years of self-control. As she used to say: "My legend is made. At the beginning of the reign I was the futile woman occupied only with ribbons, and at the close of the Empire I became the fatal woman responsible for all the mistakes and all the misfortunes. Legend is always stronger than history."

Her mind was distinctly virile and her intellect that of a serious man of affairs. She certainly had more influence on the Emperor than he had on her, but she understood that she was expected by Paris to play that rôle of fashion which she accordingly did. But she always saw ahead of her generation and thought she could give utterance to it at the time; she thought even as Empress that other

Empress Eugenie in England

professions besides Sovereignty, such as Law or Medicine, might well be opened to women. Perhaps the Tuileries sheltered one of the first and rare suffragettes in Europe. Her quick and clear sense of judgment perceived the arbitrary difference accorded to women in France and England. She realized, too, that England was a country where opinion ruled, carrying the Government, whereas it was rather the reverse in France. Her political insight was her keenest gift. She inspired the Emperor with his taste for social reforms which did so much to sweeten the memory of the Third Empire. Liberal and advanced as she was in her social views, she clung to the traditional school of diplomacy, and she tended to support Austria rather than Italy, for frankly she did not believe in nationalities. After Sadowa she had wished to intervene in Austria's behalf. If she had had her way she would have united Austria and France against Prussia. She steadily refused to be enchanted by President Wilson, whom she regarded as a dreamer and a utopian of the first order. She was a man in her appreciation of facts and in her brave ability to face truths. It was typical of her character not to be fond of music and never to read novels. Her life brimmed with activities, and she did not understand people who were bored with life. She devoured books on History and Science and seldom affected a book of devotion. She preferred scientific to ecclesiastical conversation. Yet she was an unshakeable Catholic of the Spain of the Eighteenth Century, yet neither fanatical nor obtrusively devout. It would be the truth to say that like many great and good men her intellect was stronger than her heart. She had no place for the foibles and frailties of women. She was Cæsar's wife and she was not unworthy to be Cæsar herself. But as her splendours were greater than the women of her time so her sorrows were proportional, and the mighty words of Bossuet uttered over the body of the exiled Henrietta Maria Queen of England could be echoed over the last Empress of the French—"He who reigneth in the Heavens and raiseth up all the Empires, to whom

Empress Eugenie in England

alone belongeth glory, majesty and independence, He alone hath the glory of being a law giver to kings and of dealing them according to His pleasure great and terrible lessons. Whether He raiseth or lowereth thrones, whether He giveth His power to princes or taketh it unto Himself, leaving them only their own weakness, He teacheth them their duties in a sovereign manner and worthy of Himself."

F. CABROL.

Farnborough.

DISRAELI : THE CONCLUSION

THE opposition of outlook between the Christian and the Jew is, or at least has been for fifty years or more, in this resolutely and sometimes wisely superficial country, a despised and neglected political antinomy, even though its recognition appears to furnish a clue to much that is obscure and difficult in the history both of the past and the present. There are, indeed, some—and these not the least gifted of men—upon whom this antagonism exercises a fascination almost exclusive, so that *cherchez le juif* may be said to become for them as certain a formula in political as *cherchez la femme* is for others in social affairs. They are aware that all civic theories, unless these are reduced to a mere crude idolatry of the State as such, do, in the last resort, rest upon religious foundations ; and they look for the proof of their theory to such vital circumstances as the predominance of the Old Testament in Protestant theology, or the triumph of the economic revolution initiated by the Jews of Amsterdam in the sixteenth century and defended by the genius of Ricardo in the nineteenth, of which the ultimate effect has been to plant the standard of Mammon in the centre of the field of industry, and fatally to prejudice the old fidelities and humanities of the Catholic civilization of the Middle Age. More obvious, necessarily, to Catholic than to non-Catholic minds, the antithesis of Christian and Jewish ideas is not incapable of striking the imagination of a Protestant with great force, and may be found deeply embedded in Godet's thoughtful and ingenious essay on the Apocalypse, which in Lyttleton's translation has enjoyed, together with other New Testament studies, a large circulation among English readers for the last half-century. It is, however, in countries where Christianity is present in its Catholic fullness, or at least in its sacramental realities, and where passion rises to greater heights or intellect secures a clearer vision, than

Disraeli : the Conclusion

in our own—in countries like Poland or France or Russia—that the antithesis has made itself felt as an elemental force of which men of the world must take account. And, unless Zionism should succeed in converting Jewish energy from cosmopolitan into nationalist channels and in persuading the Jews themselves to exchange the great globe itself for a fraction of its circumference, we must expect that international Judaism will continue its struggle with Catholic Christianity—with the only true International of the spirit—and that the conflict will sometimes be waged by the worse men of both parties with weapons which the better must equally deplore.

In England, however, as has been said, we do not observe these things very closely. Neither the greater dramatists nor the greater novelists have done anything to help us to understand the Jew who digs deeper than the deepest mine of gold. Shylock is so dazzling in his sordid simplicity that he blinds our eyes to other possibilities ; and his parent, the Jew of Malta, even though in that case the stage is set for a political drama, turns out to be no more subtle than himself. Isaac is fond and feeble, an old miser with a pretty daughter ; Fagin no more than a master-pickpocket ; Daniel Deronda nothing but a lifeless likeness hanging on the wall. The Jew in all his power, in all his range of intellect, is a character still waiting to be added to the portrait gallery of English fiction.

Disraeli, it may be conjectured, was aware of the omission ; and the sketch of Sidonia, who was Rothschild idealized, seems to be an attempt to make it good. But the novelist, though a court-painter of much skill and a court-jester of more wit, was no master of the arts that are for all time and every generation. His talent forsook him on the threshold of the soul ; and his *chiaroscuro* is compounded of the charms and follies of his day. Thus Sidonia is but a profile, omniscient, passionless—a being, we might say, without purpose and without descent.

Yet, for all his limitations, the author of *Coningsby* was aware that, beneath the stage on which he kept his

Disraeli : the Conclusion

puppets dancing, certain elemental forces were at work, and that of these forces the deepest were embodied in the characters of the Catholic and the Jew. In *Contarini Fleming*—that prose version of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*—there is no more curious passage than where the poet, or study of a poet, chancing upon a church where Benediction is being given, is converted to Catholicism, suddenly, under the influence of the half-mystical, half-æsthetic notions with which he invests that sublime yet simple office. But this, at best, is but the record of a casual encounter at an impressionable hour. *Sybil* affords the real measure of Disraeli's early interest in Catholicism—*Sybil* with its confused yet significant admission, oddly introduced into the mouth of St. Lys, that "the Church of Rome is to be respected as the only Hebræo-Christian Church extant." It was in this novel, written at that sacred and pregnant moment of life when for the first time the contrast between rich and poor—between "the two nations"—strikes the imagination in all its solemnity, that he touched the hem of Catholic philosophy. The virtue thence proceeding made a Catholic both of the heroine and of Mr. Trafford, the ideal employer of labour, and infected the whole book with feeling so much deeper than the other novels possess, that to this day, when they have become little more than a satirical picture of Victorian society, it remains a moving appeal for social action on Catholic lines.

But of the voice of *Sybil*, *Lothair*, Disraeli's considered criticism of life, is but the mocking echo. Rome is satirized there as the centre of a worldly proselytism; Cardinals and Monsignori play the part required of them; and the book abounds in entertainment of this conventional kind. As an illustration, however, of the progressive development of the author's mind on Jewish lines the interest turns rather upon the figures of Clare Arundel and Theodora. These are not things of flesh and blood, but human forms framing the rival principles of Catholic devotion and political revolt, and together struggling for the soul of Lothair, a young man having great possessions,

Disraeli: the Conclusion

but little spirit, who ultimately falls, a happy lover, at the feet of the amiable Lady Corisande, a duke's daughter and a proper match.

The contest between the supernatural, or at least supranormal, powers may thus be said to end inconclusively, for Theodora dies and Clare Arundel becomes a religious. But there are indications enough that the author's animosities are allied with those uncatholic forces, which are commonly credited with finding their agents among the Masons and the Jews, their instrument in the secret society, and the object of their particular hatred in the fabric of Christendom. A casual sentence sometimes betrays a world of sentiment; and so it is in *Lothair*. When the Revolutionary, or Garibaldian Committee, with which Theodora is associated, had made itself master of Rome, and the Pope, amidst lowering skies and threatening presages of ill, had fled to the Castle of St. Angelo, then it was that "the Jews in their quarter spoke nothing, but exchanged a curious glance, as if to say, 'Has it come at last? And will they indeed serve her as she served Sion?'"

Disraeli's animosities are akin to Theodora's, but not certainly his considered convictions; and Lady Corisande covers his retreat. He, who in early life had planned to write the Revolutionary Epic and had yet deemed Metternich the only practical philosopher of his age, was not incapable of leaving the supreme political debate still, rationally-speaking, undetermined. Having vision he had seen further than most men; but having humour and imagination he was able to play the issues off against each other beneath the safe covers of the novel. The rôle of the Sphinx was of all rôles the most agreeable to him; he liked to pose riddles and to answer them with a sardonic smile; and, if interrogated, he would declare, in a phrase at least as old as Shaftesbury, that his religion was that of all sensible men. For practical purposes he seemed as if able to assimilate an enduring faith in the destiny of the Chosen Race with a Christian profession. "See where his Grace stands," said Tenniel's mocking cartoon,

Disraeli : the Conclusion

"between two clergymen." It was indeed incongruous company.

The circumstances of the time were calculated to disclose Disraeli's real significance on the page of history with rare exactitude. It happened that he was confronted by a statesman who had no religious reserves. Gladstone was the most ostentatiously, even as Aberdeen was the most unobtrusively Christian Prime Minister that this country has known ; and it is a just observation of Lord Morley's that Gladstone's critics sometimes curiously fail to see that it was his very effort to apply Christian ideas to political affairs which they object to and condemn. When all differences of training and temperament have been exhausted, and when full allowance has been made for the instinct of opposition, which is part of the equipment of a good party leader, the fundamental distinction between Gladstone and Disraeli will be found to lie in the fact that the one was a Catholic and the other a Jew. Not, of course, in the strictly religious and dogmatic sense of those words ! Disraeli, or rather his father before him, had forsaken the synagogue, and Gladstone abhorred the Pope. But just as anyone who takes the trouble to study the famous chapter on the Hebrew race in the *Life of Lord George Bentinck* will find that Disraeli's appreciation of Christianity was built upon the fact that Christ was the greatest of the Jews, so all Gladstone's political inspiration may be traced back to that supreme hour of early life when, at Rome and in face of St. Peter's, the thought of the unity of Christendom suffused his imagination with its unrivalled splendour. It was this aspect of his thought that won for him the sympathy of men like Acton in the Catholic, and like Dean Church in the Anglican camp. And on this view of things the dramatic contest between the great English political leaders of the later nineteenth century will be found to rest on nothing less trifling than a different orientation of political thought—on a conception of the world in the one case Catholic and (in the better meaning of the term) nationalist, and in the other racial and in truth Judaic.

Disraeli : the Conclusion

Lord Morley, in spite of obvious disabilities of vision, perceived this clearly ; and his biography of Gladstone is a sustained effort to view the circumstances of a political career in the light of the Eternal and the Universal. It has already been observed by a clever critic that it is in this point precisely that Mr. Buckle has failed. His work is admirably solid, and, if one may say so without impertinence, excellently discharged. He has written the longest political biography in the English language ; and no part of his story is slurred or shirked or scamped. He leaves no crumbs for the student ; and no more than a *réchauffi* for the historian. But—to change the metaphor—the portrait of Disraeli is copied from a photograph. We see him from hour to hour and from day to day, passing as in a cinema, but we are not shown whence he comes or whither he goes. Never in all the book is the darksome statesman, moving beneath the vast shadow of Time, drawn for a little moment under the white light of Eternity—unless, indeed, it be in that last chapter where Mr. Monypenny's rough notes are too modestly allowed to supplement, if not to supplant, Mr. Buckle's considered conclusions. Disraeli, we are told by his earlier biographer, was a mystery, if a mystery at all, only in the sense in which all men are mysterious. Yes ! but in a very different degree. Mystery, as distinct from mere secretiveness or reserve, is the effect of an enhanced perception of the supernatural ; and it was this which Disraeli both possessed and concealed. John Oliver Hobbes's sketch of him in *Robert Orange*, slight as it is, shows a quality and penetration lacking in the official biography with its meritorious care and fuller information. There is, in fact—for we are all creatures of circumstance—something of Mr. Buckle, the editor, left in Mr. Buckle, the biographer ; something in the outlook and the argument which suggests short views and temporary defences. And there is something also of the editorial manner to be found in the style. There are no phrases so trite as to be distressing, but none so brilliant as to seem original. The narrative eschews alike the flamboyant image and the

Disraeli : the Conclusion

purple patch. All is plain, decent and in order, the work of a scholar and a gentleman who instinctively effaces himself and prefers, where possible, to let his subject tell the tale. It is a system much in vogue, yet full of peril, for it is not all men who, being dead, are yet capable of speaking. But Disraeli's life submits to this treatment as well as any man's ; and the method possesses the qualities of its defects. Mr. Buckle, in short, may be placed in that school of biographers who aim, not at a study exciting interest by its suggestiveness or its novelty, but at the presentation by clear lines and sober colours of such admitted traits of a character as all sensible men will agree to recognize, and as even contentious men may be indisposed to challenge. He can feel assured of the pious thanks of the Greeks, and, it is to be hoped also, of the more lucrative praises of the Barbarians, even if the crowning felicitations of High Olympus should be denied him.

It is a remark, and a striking remark, of Mr. Monypenny's that we see Disraeli in the first phase of his life unshackled by party ties and in the last phase dominant over party purposes, but that in the middle period of his career he is compelled to pay, with dulling results to his talent, a tribute to convention. The course of the biography itself has undoubtedly enforced this opinion. Mr. Monypenny's opening volumes were lively enough to make him the lion of a London season, in the days, that is, before the war when lions were kept for the drawing-room instead of being despatched to the battle-field. In the middle volumes there was an obvious loss of vitality and distinction, which was too readily attributed to deficiencies in Mr. Buckle himself. The concluding part of the vast undertaking shows a marked recovery of the power to interest and to please. It includes the story of Disraeli's two premierships—the ten months' premiership of 1868, and the six years' premiership of 1874-1880—and it covers the period of his supreme social success, when he moved no longer in the doubtful and adventurous circle of Gore House, but amongst people of whom the French language

Disraeli : the Conclusion

alone affords a finished description—amongst the *crème de la crème*. Mr. Buckle has had the advantage of being able to emphasize the intimacy which characterized Disraeli's relations with Queen Victoria, and to disclose the affection which underlay his friendships with Lady Bradford and Lady Chesterfield ; and it is no exaggeration to say that these romances, the one of public devotion, the others of private regard, furnish the main theme of what may be called the Beaconsfield phase of his life, even amid the pomp and circumstance of great place and the exigency of great affairs. No one, probably, had fully appreciated before how much the accidental presence of a woman on the throne had contributed to inspire and facilitate his success. Froude, indeed, had noticed how fortunate Disraeli had been in his times—times when the peerage had lost its monopoly of place and power and a Disraeli might hope to seize positions beyond the reach of Burke ; times when the House of Commons could still tolerate eloquence and claim prestige, and platform oratory was but the incident of a political career ; times, in short, when Tory-democracy was still accented on the earlier syllables and Conservatism still retained something to conserve. All this lay open to view. But few had guessed how perfectly two temperaments so apparently different as those of the Sovereign and her Minister had harmonized, how completely his oriental adulation had satisfied her taste ; and fewer still had known how really he had succeeded in making her play Elizabeth to his Spenserian fancy, so that in his most private letters she becomes "the Faery," that is the Faery-Queen. He made her an empress, and she, as we learn, had he been willing, would have created him a duke.

There could be no greater contrast than between the mere Englishry of Mr. Buckle's thought and manner and the subtle and sensuous atmosphere in which Disraeli lived and moved and had his being. Fair women and sweet flowers and luscious wine, courts and castles and senate-houses, and the language and pageantry and posture appropriate to such places ; hidden and explosive

Disraeli : the Conclusion

forces playing beneath the surface of society; and at the summit of all the Queen-Empress sitting omnipotent upon her throne—of such stuff were Disraeli's letters made and to such an Aladdin's palace, artificially but wonderfully lit by all the lamps of fancy, does he conduct us, transfiguring as by magic this drab Western world of ours, at an age when for ordinary men the fires of life are burning low and all that is not iridescent with illumination from another world grows wan and faded. That unbending Jewish will of his, which of all his qualities Gladstone named the first, transported not himself alone, but others also into a region they had else not dreamed of. Nothing is more significant than the immense flatness experienced by the Commons at his removal to the Upper House. "The deep feeling of regret," Sir William Hart Dyke wrote to him on that occasion, "is quite universal throughout every corner of the House. I had no idea, until I heard you make your last speech in the House, how great the change would prove. All the real chivalry and delight of party politics seem to have departed; nothing remains but routine."

In all this fairyland of romanticism, as in those particular, embarrassing professions of devotion, addressed after his wife's death and when he was close upon seventy, to Lady Bradford, whom he adored, and to her sister, Anne, Lady Chesterfield, a widow whom he offered to marry, his flights of fancy did not lapse into anything common or unclean. He had the habit, which only mystics or Orientals can safely cultivate, of using sensuous language and extravagant phraseology to express high and pure emotion; and behind all the cynicism of his table-talk ran the canticle of his intimate correspondence.

This was not all. Disraeli's love of magnificence was not satisfied by splendour but streamed out into liberality. From the familiar tables of Dives his vision still reached as far as Lazarus without the gate; and the promise of *Sybil* did not go utterly without performance. In a chapter with which Liberals intent on claiming for Liberalism all the social legislation of the nineteenth

Disraeli : the Conclusion

century will have henceforth to reckon, Mr. Buckle has brought out the large achievement in this direction of his last Administration. "The Conservative Party," observed one of the earliest representatives of organized Labour to sit in the House, "have done more for the working-classes in five years than the Liberals have in fifty." Philanthropy, however, was already become a competitive and expert Trade ; and Disraeli, who abhorred detail, devolved its execution upon one of the least impressive and most beneficent of his colleagues—the honest and excellent man, whose patronymic, embellished by the Order of the Bath, procured for him the obvious nickname of "Grand Cross."

The social side of *Sybil* was remembered but the religious side was forgotten. The piece of domestic legislation upon which Disraeli looked back as peculiarly the work of his Sovereign and himself, was the Public Worship Regulation Act, directed against "ritualistic" practices in the Church of England. Though Mr. St. Lys, the devoted High Church clergyman in *Sybil*, had he happened to have lived into his creator's premiership, would probably have been sent to prison under its provisions, the Prime Minister, urged forward by the Queen and sustained by the bench of bishops, used his best resources of mordant epigram and perfervid Protestantism to pilot the bill past the angry assaults of Gladstone and the unfriendly embraces of Salisbury. Ritualism, he declared, was "high jinks" and the Anglican communion-service, as performed by the Ritualists, no better than "the Mass in masquerade." And he took his stand upon "the broad platform" of the Reformed faith, dwelt upon the nihilism which, but for the presence of the Church of England, would have overtaken "the various sects of the Reformation," and exhorted Englishmen to rally round the principles which "it was called into being to represent." Mr. Buckle, with much impartiality and some little inconsequence, both applauds the "earnestness and insight" of Disraeli's sentiments and deploras "their inadequate sense of the historic continuity of the

Disraeli : the Conclusion

Church." Disraeli might, perhaps, have replied that the maxim which Mr. Buckle has himself picked out of *Contarini Fleming* as a motto for his volume is well-suited to the needs of Anglican Churchmen as well as of English readers—the maxim “to read no history, nothing but biography, for that is life without theory.”

The other matter which Disraeli regarded especially as the common work of the Sovereign and the Prime Minister was that of the Queen's imperial crown ; and here we touch the core of his political romanticism. For him there sounded ever more loudly the call of the East ; and he desired that his countrymen should hear it also. There was, indeed, no better way of making it audible—no better way of bringing home to the forty million people of these Islands their responsibilities towards the myriad inhabitants of the Indian Peninsula, of whose fate they had constituted themselves the masters in “a fit of absence of mind”—than by conferring upon the Sovereign the title of Empress of India. But the question, how far that splendid title has really been more than the gaudy symbol of sovereignty which its critics fancied it would be, must sometimes force itself upon thoughtful men. If England was to be in India only as a police-force, her position was already sufficiently assured and adequately described. If, on the other hand, there was to be here a real junction between East and West, if India was to undergo the political and social penetration of Western ideas, then to the notions of Empire and Liberty, which Disraeli proclaimed as the gospel of British Imperialism, there needed the addition of that of Peace—a peace not merely of understanding, but precisely passing understanding, based upon those supernatural foundations which lie so deep in the West as to pass unperceived, but which must be laid again wherever, as in India, a new racial contact is producing the slow dissolution of an old society. A Catholic, indeed, who advances such opinions must expect to be reminded of what, crudely accepted and cruelly enforced, they led to in the Spanish Colonies in the sixteenth century ; but his apologies and regrets

Disraeli : the Conclusion

for the methods once employed ought not to betray him into an abandonment of an aim for ever enjoined. The effective realization of a Catholic Society, dominating the distinction of Jew and Greek, as it has already dominated that of bond and free, and tempering and transfiguring the spirit of nationality until it broadens into nationhood, is the only alternative to a war of races, striving for pre-eminence as they strove before the idea of the Church had come into the world. It was Disraeli's belief in race as the ultimate factor in political life that definitely marks off his mind as a Judaic one, and divides it, as by a great gulf fixed, from that of Gladstone. And the effect was to make his Indian conception incomplete—to leave the crown of India only a splendid jewel, set, it may be, somewhere in the Masonic design of Solomon's Temple, but unset in that larger spiritual structure into which all the nations of the world are required to bring their honour and glory, and without which empires can only rise to fall and prosper to decay.

Disraeli's last public observation of any note was a kind of epitaph upon his policy and in itself a sufficient proof of its limitations. The key of India, he said in remembered words, is London. And it was, in fact, through the gloom of metropolitan mentality—through the medium of stocks and shares, of a European war, and an English Cabinet crisis that the Englishmen of his time for the most part beheld the greatest of their imperial burdens. Upon the purchase of the Khedive's Suez Canal shares, which gave to England at the cost of four millions of money a stake in that concern falling not very far short of one-half of the whole, there is no need to speak here, except to say that it is the one act of Disraeli's Administration of which no one now doubts the wisdom, and that it is an act which no mere English Prime Minister would have been likely to think of or at least have been likely to push through to a conclusion. The Near Eastern crisis of 1876-78 did not appear to be quite so obviously related to Indian affairs as the control of the shortest route from England to its principal dependency ;

Disraeli : the Conclusion

and it was in fact at this time that Salisbury, then Secretary for India, gave his famous advice to use large maps. Nevertheless, the presence of Russia on the shores of the Bosphorus and the occupation by Russia of the capital of him who claimed to be caliph of Islam, could hardly be a thing indifferent to the masters of India, and was certainly not so to Disraeli.

The narrative of the events which led up to the Congress of Berlin fills a full half of Mr. Buckle's final volume ; and it may probably remain the most detailed account of them from the English ministerial standpoint. But almost inevitably in every forest of facts the wood sometimes vanishes among the trees ; and there is a danger in following a policy from week to week and day to day that explanation may grow to seem defence, and an *apologia* be thought to suffice where an apology is needed. There are some who will feel that these are the defects of Mr. Buckle's presentation of the history of the Nearer Eastern Crisis of 1876-78.

In July, 1875, the Slavs of Herzegovina rose against their Turkish rulers ; and in the autumn of that year they were joined by those of Bosnia. Disraeli made it clear at the Lord Mayor's banquet that, in any settlement of the Balkan troubles, the interests of the Empress of India would have to be considered. The three European Emperors, united by the *Dreikaiserbündniss*, kept, however their own counsel ; and the famous Andrassy Note of December 30th was the work of Austria, Russia and Germany without England. The policy of the Note was to localize the conflict and to invite Turkey to redress grievances in the revolted provinces under the superintendence of a mixed commission ; and to this the English Government assented, but tardily and reluctantly, stipulating at the same time for the independence of the Porte. That ancient Hypocrisy returned as usual fair words and did nothing. Then, in April, 1876, Bulgaria rose ; and in May the French and German consuls were murdered in Salonica ; whilst the revolt of Serbia and Montenegro became no more than a matter of time. In

Disraeli : the Conclusion

these circumstances Bismarck prepared a memorandum, requiring Turkey to grant a two-months armistice to its rebellious subjects and to negotiate with them on a stated basis of reform, the Powers threatening "efficacious intervention" if these proposals failed of their object. Disraeli, irritated at the drafting of another plan without English assistance, and fearful that "efficacious" measures might mean the violation of Turkish integrity by Russia, rejected Bismarck's proposals; thus, as Gladstone maintained, destroying the Concert of Europe, in whose representations France and Italy, though at this time no more in fact than second-class Powers, had been ready to join. A palace-revolution in Constantinople, which substituted a weak-minded boy for a half-insane spendthrift, came to the relief of the embarrassed Powers of Europe and gave Disraeli some weeks of ill-placed hope. Then, at midsummer, Serbia and Montenegro rose in rebellion; and at the same time the story of the atrocities committed by the Turks in Bulgaria began to come out. Disraeli, misinformed or rather malinformed by Derby's incompetent Foreign Office, pronounced these allegations to be coffee-house babble; and Mr. Buckle tells us he was right. But babble is sometimes worth attention; and even in coffee-houses they sometimes speak the truth. Though, as Walter Baring, Disraeli's special envoy, presently reported, not 24,000 but 12,000 Bulgarians had been slaughtered, there was still room for indignation, if not interference; and, whilst Englishmen might be slow to wish for war with the Turks, they might as reasonably shrink from becoming their allies. Even newspapers as august as that with which Mr. Buckle has had so long and distinguished a connection are capable of giving currency to horrors inadequately proved, and, in the circumstances stated, a mere politician like Gladstone may properly be excused, in spite of Queen Victoria's severe strictures, for such intemperance as existed in the proposal to bundle the Turks out of Bulgaria, "bag and baggage."

Meanwhile, the sons of the Prophet continued success-

Disraeli : the Conclusion

fully to drive their enemies before them ; whilst in Constantinople a new palace-revolution, of which Disraeli took the same comfortable view as of the last, had placed upon the throne Abdul Hamid, as great an assassin as any of the Old Turks he succeeded, but inferior in this respect to the Young Turks who followed him. The subject-peoples of Turkey and their Russian kinsmen did not share Disraeli's optimism ; and, as the year wore on and the Turks continued to advance victoriously upon Belgrade, their restlessness increased. Finally, the Russian Government intervened. Turkey was compelled on pain of the severance by Russia of diplomatic relations to accept an armistice ; and at the same time a solemn and personal assurance was given to the English Ambassador by the Russian Emperor that he neither wanted Constantinople nor wished for anything beyond a provisional occupation of Bulgaria. English policy at this juncture aimed at a Conference. This was agreed upon ; and the plenipotentiaries, with Salisbury as the English representative, sat in Constantinople between the end of November, 1876, and the end of January, 1877. The two months' discussion yielded nothing. The Turks proved a match for the Christians ; proclaimed a liberal Constitution on the eve of the Conference ; temporized ; then, when the time seemed ripe, rejected the mediation of the Powers and quietly reverted to the practice, if not the form, of the *ancien régime*.

Once more Russia set the forces of diplomacy to work. General Ignatieff, the Russian envoy at the Conference, with whom Salisbury had become intimate—too intimate, as Disraeli thought—at Constantinople, went on a European mission ; and in April a protocol, re-embodiment of the ideas of the Greater Powers on the question of Turkish reform, was presented for the Sultan's acceptance. The Porte rejected it ; and it was then, at last, that Russia moved.

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877 had marked vicissitudes, but before the year was out fortune declared unmistakably in favour of the Christian Power. During

Disraeli : the Conclusion

the nine months of its duration the English Cabinet was torn with division. The Prime-Minister, in a letter to the Queen, even affirmed the existence of seven parties within it. It is enough, however, for present purposes to recognize the existence of two—that which under the guidance of Disraeli contemplated war and that which, in more or less close association with Derby, struggled for peace. In the latter were contained, with the exception of Gathorne-Hardy, the Secretary for War, all the more prominent English Churchmen in the Cabinet—Salisbury, Carnarvon, Cairns and Cross. To the two first of these in particular it was repugnant to fight with the Turks against Russia ; and Disraeli supposed them both to be considerably affected by the opinions of Liddon, a great preacher of his Church and time, who was displaying much energy in the anti-Turkish crusade. To make confusion worse, the Queen wrote, as he said, almost every day and telegraphed almost every hour, to exhort him to take immediate action. At issue with his Foreign and Indian Secretaries and in imperfect control of his Cabinet, he resorted to a subterfuge. With the Queen's assent, but without Derby's knowledge, Colonel Wellesley was despatched in August, 1877, to take a confidential message to the Russian Emperor. Its contents were startling enough and its assurance more startling still. Colonel Wellesley was authorized to say that, should the Russo-Turkish War run on into another campaign, England would intervene ; and he was particularly enjoined to add that it was false to suppose that the Government suffered from divided counsels which might prevent this step. "The Cabinet," so the Memorandum dexterously alleged, "was led by one mind and had the entire support of the Sovereign." Mr. Buckle half condemns and half condones these strange proceedings. He is too kind to his hero and too cruel to the British Constitution.

Days and discussions and dissensions drifted on. Derby's composure, which had once seemed to Disraeli so valuable, had now become in his chief's eyes a reproach and an annoyance ; and it seemed as if, like Horace's

Disraeli : the Conclusion

rustic, the Foreign Secretary looked on whilst the river of opportunity flowed away. Only Disraeli's purpose held clear, not impetuous like the Queen's, nor uncertain like the Cabinet's. He possessed, indeed, inexhaustible patience and exquisite humour ; and he had besides too great a sense of fun not to enjoy playing the rôle of Mephistopheles which his foes incautiously allotted to him. In December the Queen paid a visit to Hughenden, thus positively identifying her views with those of the Prime Minister by doing him an honour which only Melbourne had received before him. That same month in the *penetralia* of the Cabinet, circumstances over which Mr. Buckle glides with discretion and economy, telling enough to satisfy the claims of truth and not enough to wound those of affection, developed a change of feeling. From this time Salisbury began to draw towards his chief, though as late as the middle of January, 1878, he still associated his fortunes with those of Derby. Events, meanwhile, were drawing at last to a head. The war was decided. Russia was clearly mistress of the field ; and, even though the victor refused the mediation of England, which the vanquished desired, the way was open, as commonly when blood has once been shed, for a firmer diplomacy than could probably have been successful at an earlier date ; and the more on this occasion that Austria was, in the changed circumstances, become a potential ally. Salisbury saw this, but Derby failed to see it ; and the two men drew rapidly apart. The decisive issue was the question of sending the fleet up to Constantinople. Upon this point Derby resigned ; and the Queen immediately approved Salisbury's succession to his place. But, before the resignation could take effect, the party-managers discovered that in the then state of public opinion Derby was too influential a man to be lost. The recall of the orders to the fleet, owing to a telegram being muddled and misunderstood, opened a passage for his return. He came back reluctantly, resolutely and properly insisting that he would take no post but the one he had vacated. He might have spared himself the effort.

Disraeli : the Conclusion

In two months he had resigned again ; and the lifelong connection between Disraeli and the Stanleys had snapped for good.

The swopping of horses in mid-stream is proverbially dangerous, but, if it comes off, it means, or ought to mean, a rare degree of understanding between the rider and his second mount. Disraeli and his new Foreign Secretary had known all the bitterness of antagonism, but they had gained also a critical knowledge of each other's minds and of each other's characters. There is no better basis for friendly co-operation. The moment of Salisbury's famous circular despatch to the Courts of Europe was indeed ripe with opportunity. If the Cabinet had lost Derby and Carnarvon, it was the stronger for having threshed out its policy. On the Continent the Great Powers were sufficiently discomposed by Russian success to be ready to follow a lead against Russian aggression. And, most important of all, with the certain prospect of increased self-government in the Balkans, the question of Turkish misgovernment had receded into the background, and the deeper question of the preservation of European settlements had consequently come to the front.

On this latter issue the British Government obtained an undeniable victory in the very assembling of the Congress of Berlin. The treaty just concluded between Russia and Turkey—the Treaty of San Stefano—was not permitted to upset the provisions of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, without reference to Europe sitting in council. This was Disraeli's real contribution to the cause of European solidarity and European peace. But all the rest of his achievement was no more than diplomatic fireworks. The "big" Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano, approximating though it did to racial requirements, was shorn of Macedonia and of Eastern Rumelia—the region south of the Balkans—so that the Turks retained the Balkan passes. But seven years later, with Salisbury at the Foreign Office and consenting to the deed, Prince Alexander of Bulgaria made himself master of the abstracted province. By that time the policy of making

Disraeli : the Conclusion

the Balkan States strong and independent, the policy of a Catholic, Sir William White, whose ability Salisbury had discovered at Constantinople, had gained acceptance. But the psychological moment for its application had gone by. Bosnia and Herzegovina, instead of being formed into an autonomous state under a Christian Governor, as the Treaty of San Stefano had proposed, had been handed over by the Berlin Treaty to Austrian occupation ; and the Austrian occupation, issuing, as it unavoidably did, in annexation, proved to be one of the proximate causes of the Great War.

In Asia, Disraeli's arrangements fared little better. At Berlin it was agreed that Batum, which Russia obtained under the San Stefano Treaty, should be declared "a free port, essentially commercial." But the Russian Government in due time repudiated this undertaking, as she had once before repudiated the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris. It is not the Germans alone who have seen in their pledges no more than pieces, or, as propaganda prefers to have it, "scraps" of paper.

The Batum business entailed no more than a humiliation, but the Cyprus Convention involved a reproach. In return for the lease of that island, England saddled herself with the military obligation to defend the Turkish dominions in Asia against Russia and the moral obligation to see that their government was reformed. She was not called upon to fulfil the one, and she did not exert herself to fulfil the other. It is hardly too much to say that the awful fate of the Armenians, which we have beheld, is the outcome of British ineptitude or British indifference in the past. Better far to have left those unhappy people to the long arm of Russia, or to such desperate defences as their own right hand could put up, than to have led them to look for succour which we never gave ! A wise statesmanship never engages to accomplish what it cannot clearly see its way to execute.

Thus Disraeli's principal political achievement will not stand the dry light of criticism ; and, though something must be allowed to biographers, who are the legatees of

Disraeli: the Conclusion

the reputations of the dead and their advocates in the court of history, it is rather melancholy to find Mr. Buckle so little judicial as to claim for the author of the Treaty of Berlin the foremost place among British statesmen since Chatham and Pitt, and to speak of him as "the faithful custodian of his country's interests," "for ever associated with the maintenance and presentation to the external world of England's magnificent and awful cause." Disraeli's career cannot bear the weight of praise like this. It is not only that he was condemned by many of the best and most representative men of his time—by men like Shaftesbury and Bright, Carlyle and Ruskin, Browning and Morris and Burne-Jones, Argyll and Westminster, as well as by Gladstone and that band of "priests and professors" he alleged to haunt Carnarvon, by Liddon and Freeman and Froude—but that he was condemned also in the end by the very colleague whom he associated with himself in the claim to have returned from Berlin bringing "peace with honour," and whose ancestor—the first Robert Cecil—had, in fact, used that famous phrase three centuries before. It was Salisbury, though Mr. Buckle omits to recall the circumstance, who observed some twenty years afterwards that the Government of 1878, in pursuance of the policy of 1853, had "put all its money on the wrong horse." Subsequent events—events so large and so terrible that it seems extraordinary that Mr. Buckle should have failed to see the interpretation of them—have demonstrated even more fully the greatness of Disraeli's error in sustaining a nation, sick to death and abandoned to corruption, instead of seeking to throw across the path of imperial ambition, whether German or Russian, a federation of autonomous and independent Slavonic States. So that Time's revenges have not failed, and "good but nervous and somewhat weak and sentimental Lord Carnarvon," as Queen Victoria called him, has proved longer-sighted than his more practical colleagues, not only in regard to South Africa and Ireland, but also in regard to the problems of the Nearer East!

Disraeli : the Conclusion

The truth is that Disraeli's outlook was narrowed and his vision blunted by the very doctrine of race in which he boasted himself. His Christianity was not real enough to issue in Catholicity. He was, indeed, politically what he claimed to be metaphysically—"on the side of the angels," for the angels had been the guardians and ministers of the dispensation in which he believed—the dispensation which prevailed before the advent of Christ, and of which the formula was "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." He did not perceive what many far less brilliant men than himself are now aware of—that in face of modern scientific developments, pride of race tends to be, as the Turk and the German have actually made it, a doctrine of destruction, whilst the extension of Catholic feeling and Catholic faith has, through the irony of circumstance or the providence of God, become the only hope of the world. Bismarck spoke more profoundly than he knew, when, in reviewing the personalities at the Berlin Congress, he observed, "*Der alte Jude das ist der Mann.*" Disraeli, as he aged, had developed the limitations as well as the will-power of his people. Race, not Christianity, was for him the ultimate cosmopolitan fact; and in a time when popular movements were everywhere smothering the remnants of feudal civilization, he tended to see the world, not, like Gladstone, as a group of small nationalities, naturally pacific and contributing each its specific sweetness or colour to the mystic rose of Christendom, but as a rivalry of imperial races—Turk and Muscovite, Saxon and Latin—with the Hebrew intellectually dominant over them all.

Only, indeed, on the hypothesis that there was a conflict, reaching beyond a native hostility of temperament and beyond the current political controversies of the day into the sphere of those truths which are age-long, if not precisely timeless, is it easy to account for the concentrated bitterness of Disraeli's relations with Gladstone. No rival English party-leaders of the nineteenth century have disliked each other so much. Disraeli's unsleeping humour, save for the incautious suggestion that Gladstone

Disraeli : the Conclusion

was as criminal as any Turkish assassin, kept him from the worst absurdities of hatred. But the fragment of a portrait of his rival, exquisitely inscribed with the name of Joseph Toplady Falconet, which, with one or two sketches suggestive of persons hostile to his Turkish policy, enlivens his last unfinished novel, shows that the "A.V."—the Arch-Villain—of his letters to Lady Bradford and Lady Chesterfield only escaped by a little from being paraded in effigy—the talk and laughing-stock of the town—through the drawing-rooms of Belgravia and Mayfair. Outside in the eddying current of the world's life his feelings, once at least, found further occasion for comic relief. In a story far too good to be allocated to a footnote, Mr. Buckle reports his answer to the inquiry of one of Gladstone's daughters about the identity of a certain distinguished foreigner : "That," he said, "is the most dangerous statesman in Europe—except, as your father would say, myself, or, as I should prefer to put it, your father."

Gladstone's dislike of his rival, however, sparkled with no such quips or quirks as this. He regarded Disraeli's proceedings as diabolical, and might have been supposed to regard his person as damned. It is more interesting to notice that he was not insensitive to the presence of the Judaic element in Disraeli's complex being. "I have a strong suspicion," he wrote to Argyll, "that Dizzy's crypto-Judaism has had to do with his policy. The Jews of the East bitterly hate the Christians ; who have not always used them well." It is not much of a reply to this, to point out, as Mr. Buckle does, that in one of his novels Disraeli's sympathies are not with the Turk but the Arab ; and one might nearly as well rejoin that in one of his letters Disraeli observes : "*We can't be more Turkish than the Sultan—plus Arabe que l'Arabie.*" In fact, since Disraeli's day, the Jews of the East have shown their hand ; and those who detect it in the Young Turk Revolution, which has led to massacres of Christians utterly without parallel, and in the Bolshevik Revolution which overthrew the fabric of a Christian State and inaugurated a persecu-

Disraeli : the Conclusion

tion of Christianity in Holy Russia, utterly incredible (if it had not occurred), will not find Gladstone's major premiss devoid of knowledge. As regards Disraeli's racial tendencies no one supposes, or at least no one ought to suppose, that he was the conscious agent of crypto-Judaism of the baser sort. But what one has to remember is that a thousand eyes are busy tracking the thoughts of statesmen, a thousand influences playing upon their sympathies, a thousand guides hovering about their path; and that, even if a man should learn to walk alone, he has still to overcome the bias of his own nature. Disraeli's writings are saturated with Judaism; and his sympathies were as evidently Jewish as Canning's were Greek. It is hardly to be supposed that in the most critical hours of his public life and in regard to the part of the world where Judaism is most politically active, Jewish influence went for nothing. At all events his policy was the very opposite of that which should appeal to Catholic minds. It left England without allies among the young Christian forces of the East; it laid upon her the odium of assisting to maintain the worst Government in Europe; and it was probably responsible for bringing her that offer of alliance from Germany in September, 1879, which Mr. Buckle has been the first to make public, which Disraeli was not unwilling to entertain, and the acceptance of which, if the event is any key to what might have been, must have irretrievably damaged his own reputation and that of his colleagues.

It is, therefore, rather as a party-leader than as a European statesman that Disraeli deserves to be thought great. The party he affected, has, as it happens, long possessed two names; and those names are the complement of its two dynasties and its two modes of thought. Conservatism, though Croker coined the title, is at least as old as Pitt, passes through Liverpool, Canning and Peel, and concludes in Salisbury. It is a doctrine of patience and prosperity, acceptable when times are good, agreeable to common sense, consonant with such excellent wisdom as is embodied in the maxims "to let well alone,"

Disraeli : the Conclusion

"to bear the ills one has," "to let sleeping dogs lie," "to look before you leap," "to stand in the ancient ways." But Disraeli was not of this school. He was a Tory, belonging to that more adventurous race of men who breathe most freely when change is in the air—the race which began in Bolingbroke and failed in Shelburne, which budded anew in himself and Randolph Churchill, and which, thanks to the dexterous grafting of Mr. George and Randolph Churchill's son, will, no doubt, in the fullness of time find the exact point of junction between what is most captivating in Tory-democracy and what is least obsolete in Liberalism. This party, or segment of a party, has never been oblivious of what it owes him; and, by an irony, perfect in its kind, he, who was not at all a Catholic and was not exactly a saint, is consequently venerated above all the men of his time and generation, has his day in the calendar, his statue within as well as without the Abbey, his sacred flower, his votive wreaths and garlands. It was an irony not unperceived even by those who had served in his Administration. My father was one day accosted in the Carlton Club by Dr. Ball, the Irish Solicitor-General in the second Beaconsfield Ministry. "Do you recollect," said Ball in his strong Irish brogue, "the conversations we used to have at the meetings of the Party in the library upstairs, when, smarting under the conduct of our leaders, we talked of them as the 'Jockey and the Jew'?" And now, this very morning, as I passed by Westminster, I saw Mr. Disraeli's statue covered with flowers. Why, they have canonized him as a saint !

But one cannot part with Disraeli on a note of disparagement. Englishmen love games. Here was one who, if politics be a game, played "the greatest game of all" with a zest unrivalled. Englishmen love sport. Here was one who, if the State be as a ship, sailed the seas, not just drifting and turning with the weather-cock in a manner now familiar, but with an object well-defined and after a method approved by experience. Now that the long

Disraeli : the Conclusion

voyage is all done, that the log is all laid bare, and the captain's correspondence exposed to view, even the most critical will not refuse some tear of regret, or at least some tribute of admiration, to a singular and eminent figure, so interesting, so forceful, so secretly affectionate, so pathetically courageous in the long struggle with growing infirmity and exhausting disease. In a career full of strife it is the little kindnesses and the great generousities that touch us most. Disraeli's life was lavish in these. No one can fail to be struck by his wish, when *Endymion* proved a less success than had been anticipated, to return to Messrs. Longmans the equivalent of £3,000 out of the £10,000 he had received. And in the matter of honours, which stood far higher in his scale of values than money, though not so high as the world reckons them, he could show delicacy remote from personal ambition or party needs. He took no dukedom for himself ; nor did he accept any special remainder in favour of his nephew. But for Corry, his devoted secretary, he asked a peerage, which was a thing unknown in the record of private secretaries at that time, and gave Lowe the opportunity for the most perfect imitation of a Disraelitish epigram in existence. "There had been no such thing done," said that disgusted and discredited politician, "since the Emperor Caligula made his horse a consul." But it was not upon the good and docile alone that Disraeli showered his favours, but also upon the intractable and the mockers. In the very hour of his parting with Derby he pressed upon him the honour of the Garter. And upon Carlyle, who had called him a Jewish conjurer and was, alas ! to call him as bad names again, he pressed, in a very handsome letter, a knighthood of the Bath with a pension attached. The inspiration, it is likely, was not his own. It came, perhaps, from Lady Derby, or perhaps from Carlyle's future biographer, who was Lady Derby's intimate friend. But the offer anyway was a singularly happy one, honouring him to whom it was made as great men of letters ought to be honoured, but honouring yet more him that made it. And there will be always citizens of the Republic

Disraeli : the Conclusion

of Letters to whom that little transaction, of which some memorials are still exhibited in Carlyle's house in Chelsea, will seem to be, of all Disraeli's many generousities, the most sublime, and, one might perhaps add without too much presumption, of all his acts the most Christian.

ALGERNON CECIL.

CARDINAL MANNING & THE LONDON STRIKE *of 1889*

THE tide of Revolution overwhelmed the Ninth Pius. The Thirteenth Leo by a great effort rehoisted the sail of democracy and floated the Church on the ebb. Pius had had a deep doctrinal influence on Manning, making him the ardent spearhead of Ultramontanism. But on Leo Manning had no little social effect. In consequence of a conversation with Manning, Leo said that he wrote his great Encyclical on Slavery. The even further reaching Encyclicals on Labour showed Manning's inspiration as much as Ketteler's. Manning's position in the Church was a lonely one. He was the only Cardinal, perhaps the first, to favour the Strike and the Trades Union. His theory of the Union was simply:

"What a man can do for himself the State shall not do for him. And the converse, if good. Therefore Self-Help under limitation. Self-Help is collective. Therefore Union." And in practice he subscribed to Mr. Arch's Agricultural Trades Union as early as the seventies. The Anglican Bishop of Gloucester's attitude at that time was a pious hope that Mr. Arch would be ducked in a horsepond, whereat archly Mr. Arch inquired if adult baptism was an Anglican doctrine!

Once Manning had taken the ground that violence was impermissible, he felt he could personally go a long way. After the "Bloody Sunday" riot in Trafalgar Square he wrote to Stead: "The appeal to physical force is criminal and immoral, venial in men maddened by suffering but inexcusable in others." To Mr. J. E. C. Bodley he wrote: "If the landholders, householders and capitalists will engineer a slope we may avert disastrous collisions. If they will not, I am afraid you will see a rough time." In the simplicity of his heart the Cardinal proposed that Capital should open its books and publish "a just rule for

Cardinal Manning and the

profits and salaries." As he wrote to Sir Samuel Boulton: "The only practical scheme would be in the apportionment of wages to the employees, profit subject to periodical revision." The prompt refusal of the employers implied "fear and suspicion, something to hide, i.e., disproportioned gains." When he proposed a man's right to work or to eat, the *Times* held him up for such "a wild proposition." To Tom Mann he wrote: "The public authorities ought to find work for those who want work or relief for those who cannot," and to Ben Tillett: "How can any man hinder or discourage the giving of food or help? I am very sure what Our Lord and His Apostles would do if they were in London." The solemn statistician, Giffen, was invoked to prophesy that a "tremendous cataclysm" would follow the Cardinal's remedy. Perhaps it more nearly resulted from the failure to adopt it.

The friendship between the Cardinal and the London Labour leaders was interesting in view of the critical dock strike of 1889, the first extensive sympathetic strike to arrest the Metropolis and the first to secure a real victory or peace with honour for unskilled Labour. The Cardinal must have valued the testimonials of Labour. Tom Mann on Manning was a simple statement commendable to all hierarchies: "I shall ever remember him as the finest example of genuine devotion to the down-trodden. He was never too busy to be consulted or too occupied with Church affairs to admit of his giving detailed attention to any group of men whom kindly influence could help, and he was equally keen to understand any plans of ours to improve the lot of these men." The Cardinal used to insist to Ben Tillett that true agitatorship included "a cross as well as a crown." And Tillett bore witness of the effect of the Cardinal's influence, "how it burned and singed my nature and called out of the depths the primitive courage and so the persistence which helped in the formation of the Gasworkers' Union." Courage and persistence were certainly required of all who shared in the Dockers' Revolt in August, 1889, whether carrier or cardinal.

London Strike of 1889

In these days, when the sixteen shillings has become a docker's wage, it seems difficult to believe how fearsome and revolutionary it seemed to add a penny to the five-pence the dockers gained per hour. The hungry men who carried the food of London struck for their "tanner," and before they won it the Guards had been mobilized at the Tower. The "sympathy" generated set the Thames on fire. A no-work manifesto and the prospect of starvation among women and children brought the Cardinal into the fray. Mr. Champion recorded the three decisive stages of the strike as follows :

- "1. The ultimatum of the Directors to hold no further parley.
2. The concession of a few wharf owners to accept the men's terms.
3. The intervention of Cardinal Manning!"

On August 30th, Miss Harkness brought Manning word from the strikers. "Half an hour later," she wrote, "I saw Cardinal Manning. Then I went away to fetch a list of the Dock Directors. When I came back he was saying Mass. After that I had the satisfaction of seeing him drive off in his carriage to the City." It was as though a dying man went down to rescue a dead city. The Port of London lay as stagnant as Tyre, and the prelate Disraeli had caricatured as the Archbishop of Tyre set out in spite of eighty years on his mission of civic first aid. There was no more perfect or dramatic episode in his life than when the Cardinal arose in the twilight of life to face the fierce and bitter reality of a London strike.

As the Mayor and the Home Secretary were out of town, he proceeded to admonish the Dock Directors at Dock House. He spoke as the brother of a former Chairman and threatened that revolution was imminent. They listened grimly to what he had to say for the men, but he had to confess to the strikers afterwards that he had never preached to so impenitent a congregation. A week later the Mayor returned and an enthusiastic curate fetched the Bishop of London. A strong committee

Cardinal Manning and the

was formed around the Cardinal, who remained the pivot and pioneer of proceedings. Lord Buxton was a member and described how "day after day from 10 in the morning till 7 or 8 at night he spent interviewing, discussing, negotiating, sometimes waiting hour after hour patiently but anxiously at the Mansion House. He never appeared disheartened or cast down. He was always confident that with time, tact and patience, peace would speedily prevail." Ben Tillett described the rivalry of the Churches. "It was interesting to watch the combat of the Churches over the bodies of the dockers. But the older man was more human and subtle, his diplomacy that of the ages and the Church. He chided the pomp of the Lord Mayor, the harshness of Temple, the pushfulness of Burns."

The Cardinal explained his attitude to Lord Buxton, then member for Poplar. "Capital has plenty of spokesmen and supporters. Labour but few and those largely non-influential, ill-recognized or even suspect. Capital is quite capable of looking after itself. Labour has as yet few backers and friends. I cannot be wrong therefore in throwing my weight on that side. It will but help to restore the balance." The Cardinal had the ear of Labour and it was now a question what date the dockers would accept, the dockers having demanded their sixpence at a few hours' notice. April 1st was proposed, but rejected by the men as foolery. Then March 1st. "I appeal to your Eminence," said Burns, "whether the men have not behaved with sweet reasonableness." "My son, they have," replied the Cardinal. January 1st was then proposed and accepted. Cardinal, Bishop and Mayor waited on the Directors that evening and the next day the latter gave a grudging acceptance on condition the strikers acceded that evening. That evening the Cardinal waited at the Mansion House in vain for an answer and late that night went sadly home.

The embittered strikers had issued a manifesto repudiating all that had been agreed. In Hyde Park the following day, a Sunday, they demanded October 1st, and gave an impression of having broken their word. Cardinal

London Strike of 1889

(reluctantly indeed), Bishop and Mayor wrote to the *Times*: "We are at a loss to understand how Messrs. Burns and Tillett can have appended their names to a manifesto which is a repudiation of what we all understood they had agreed to." The Directors withdrew in disgust. Bishop Temple, according to his biographer, left "such honour and glory as there was, even as he left the diplomacy, to those who cared about them." In fact he left Manning to make the best of a bad business. Manning forbade the strikers to serenade his house, but he listened to Tillett's explanation. Tillett personally had been set back by a letter from Temple scolding the dockers as though they were schoolboys. And neither Tillett nor Burns could hold the men. But the Cardinal agreed to summon their leaders to the Mansion House the next day, where with sweet diplomacy he waylaid them on the stairs to get in the first word. At the discussion which followed, November 4th was proposed, and Mr. Toomey made the fateful proposal that Manning should meet the strikers themselves on their own ground. The Mayor left London, but the Cardinal drove down East with Buxton, and a conference of over three hours took place in the Wade Street Schools. Manning tactfully shook hands with as many of the men as possible, but even his eloquence made no way during two hours of discussion, and even his friend Tillett was in opposition. After all had spoken, Manning rose and analysed their arguments. With skill and lucidity he drew the threads of the controversy into his hands. In turn he pleaded or threatened. Then he played his last card. He passed from questions of date and compromise to a higher plane. Pleading for their wives and children he said he was ready, if the leaders did not hear him, to appeal to the rank and file himself. There were twenty thousand Irish Catholics in the docks and they would hear his voice. He began to carry his hearers and a light seemed to rest over his head. When he sat down peace was assured.

Tom McCarthy, a Catholic follower, had been won. Finally an English Socialist, Champion, who used to say,

Cardinal Manning and the

"If the Cardinal told me to cut my hair in a tonsure I should do it," proposed that "This meeting empowers Cardinal Manning to inform the Dock Directors that the men are willing to meet them half-way in the matter of the time at which the payment is to begin and to accept November 4th as the date." Tillett was left in a minority of 15 to 28, but magnanimously proposed that the minority should acquiesce. Lord Buxton recorded: "If when we entered the room the proposal we have come to suggest had been put to the vote it would have been unanimously and scornfully rejected. When we left the room the Cardinal had in his pocket a resolution unanimously passed and signed by all the leaders." The resolution empowered the Cardinal to act for London Labour *sub invocatione* Tillett, Burns, Champion, Regan, Walsh and Toomey.

As he drove home with Buxton, the Cardinal observed, "This shows the perpetual advantage of acting on the aphorism of life. If you want a thing done, go! If you want it neglected, send!" He waited for two days before using his powers until the Directors had grown a little anxious under public opinion. As negotiations had broken down the public was a little surprised to hear the Cardinal being alluded to as "The Grand Old Man of the Strike" in Labour speeches. When he prepared to visit the Directors as a plenipotentiary of the men, the Mayor sent him his authority by telegram. On September 12th, the Directors agreed to consider the terms "especially if they come through Cardinal Manning," but on condition the sympathy strike was also ended. This occupied the Cardinal and Lord Buxton two days of further persuasion, but on September 14th all came in and signed. An hour later the Directors did the same and the Cardinal's Peace was proclaimed. To an East End priest the Cardinal scribbled, "This is a great joy, thank God. I am too weary to come and shall make to-morrow a day of rest. But give my blessing to your people."

To Lord Buxton he wrote the next day (September 15th,

London Strike of 1889

1889): "For a month past I have seen the Thames as stagnant as the Dead Sea. To-morrow I hope to see it once more full of life and motion, worthy of the Port of London." And a few days later: "If the Directors a month ago had met their own men, face to face, until they had come to agreement, the strike would have ended in ten days. Instead of this they tried to go round at the back of the men and to fill their places with men from Greenock, Liverpool and, it was said, from Antwerp. If they had succeeded we should have had bloodshed. Fifty thousand strangers at work and fifty thousand old hands out in the cold would have ended in an interminable conflict. Their failure in this has saved them. And then they call on us to rescue them from the dangers caused by their partial success in a blind policy." The Cardinal disapproved of the "blackleg" intensely, nor would he accept the view of the Directors that they had the right to buy their labour in the cheapest market. His interest in Trade Unions caused intense disapproval among his flock. Manning was ahead of his times. As he had proposed an out-of-work dole in the *Times*, he now proposed Labour Exchanges, writing in the *New Review*: "What we may hope will come from this strike is a registration of labourers and an organization of Labour." The Cardinal's subscription to the dockers' strike both impressed and upset opinion. G. W. Smalley, the American correspondent, complained to Lord Randolph Churchill that the Cardinal was encouraging disorder. Lord Randolph replied, "What do you mean by encouraging disorder? I would gladly give £25 myself if I had it!"

The men themselves subscribed £160 with an Address to the Cardinal, who devoted it to the London Hospital. Their words must have been among the most cherished of his life: "When we remember how your Eminence, unasked and unsolicited, under the weight of fourscore and two years, came forward to mediate between master and man, when we remember your prudent and wise counsels not to let any heat of passion or unreasonable view of the

Cardinal Manning and the

position beguile us or lead us away from the fair point of duty to our employers and ourselves, and when in fine we recall to mind your venerable figure in our midst for over four hours in the Wade Street School listening to our complaints and giving us advice in our doubts and difficulties, we seem to see a father in the midst of a loving and well-loved family rather than the ordinary mediator or benefactor in the thick of a trade dispute. The happy consummation of your Eminence's labours will be treasured in our own grateful hearts and handed down to our children as a choice heirloom of love and grateful affection. What we offer to you to-day is but a mite in comparison with our feelings and desires."

The dock strike was perhaps the most signal victory in Manning's life. It was vivid, historically complete, and satisfied his longing to go down among the toilers and achieve their good by his personal influence. It required great patience and a quite unofficial love for his flock to guide such a strike and strikers. They recognized a personal element outside human strife, something from the upper airs. As the powers of Capital were invoking the use of soldiery, the Cardinal really seemed for a moment to stand like the good priest in Zola's *Germinal* between soldier and striker. The helplessness of the docker appealed to him more than the better organism of the artisans. Noticing the unnoticed and helping the helpless was one of his traits. He realized how economically wrong it was for men to fight each other at the dockgates for a starveling wage. The justice of the strikers' claim is now so apparent that it is obvious they would have won eventually. But the Cardinal by winning them to a slight compromise saved them a winter's struggle. His intervention and the arrival of an enormous subsidy from Australian Labour took the wind out of the Directors' sails. "The suavity of the dear old man saved the situation," was Tillett's opinion, and in after years he could humorously recall the restraining influence on himself. The Cardinal had bound him to make no wild speeches for a while and asked him whether

London Strike of 1889

he had kept his promise. "Fairly," answered the leader of thousands, feeling like a guilty schoolboy, as the Cardinal drew a recent speech from a drawer and began to read it in a clear voice. Tillett turned away crestfallen till he heard the magical words, "My dear Benjamin, if I were as young as you I should do the same!"

From the time of the dock strike Manning became a pivot of arbitration in future troubles. "Constantly appealed to by both sides," wrote Lord Buxton, "he tried to hold the balance fairly. More than one strike he averted. Others he brought to an end." He wisely did not sit in judgment, but brought men to judge each other more wisely. He knew that on technical points arising in dispute he was a fisherman off his waters. "When he came across the differences of coaling into a stokehold or into a barge," said Sir Samuel Boulton, the Chairman of the Conciliation Board, "he expressed no opinion." But he took endless care to ascertain his facts. He gave his assent to the Conciliation Board. The Cardinal brought the men into the scheme which constituted both men's and employers' representatives in the position of a combined but non-compulsory referee. He supplied Sir Samuel with a précis on the Oliver Wharf strike, which was an echo of the dock strike and also a test for successful conciliation (February 9th, 1890):

"I have ascertained the following facts:

"1. That the majority of the docks and of the wharves, before the strike, were paying (that is, not deducting) the meal time. 2. That since the agreement of September 14th the deduction was made *in all* docks and wharves, even where old custom had existed to the contrary. 3. That the effect of this was to give 23s. with the right hand and to reduce it to 21s. 6d. with the left. 4. That a new grievance was thereby created, from which arose all the first discontent and agitation to get back the old custom. Agitation once begun runs wild. This was the grit in the wheel put in by the Dock Directors. Now I may be told that I ought to have seen this on September 14th.

Cardinal Manning and the

I have publicly taken the blame of not seeing it, in the *Times*.

"But the facts are: 1. That the meal time was not among the demands of the men. I was working with their printed demands in my hand, and it was not there. 2. I took the Directors' terms to be a *declaratory* not an *enacting* proposition, i.e., a concession of the additional penny an hour, without change of other existing customs. It never crossed me that they were giving and taking away. *Caveat emptor* is good law, and I am to blame for not inquiring further; but if I had been in their place I should have resented such a suspicious inquiry. But so stands the case and I must believe that for this part of the agitation they are answerable."

Another letter shows how the Cardinal induced Mr. Mann to withdraw his opposition to the Conciliation Board (April 12th, 1890):

"Mr. Mann came on Thursday and was very reasonable. He had his mistrusts of capitalists and did not understand the perfectly free and voluntary nature of our work. He promised me that he would not oppose it; but held to his preference for their own plan. I do not think it will come to much, and that on the first strain it will go to pieces. But I see that the trades are opposed. As yet they do not understand it. It will win its way by succeeding."

To Archbishop Walsh, who had adopted the same idea in Dublin, he wrote (March 1st, 1890): "We have been under the despotism of Capital. The union of Labourers is their only shelter and the Capitalists have now wisely formed a union of their own. This is altogether legitimate and it has rendered the intervention of a third party necessary to peace and fair play on both sides. I am glad that you like our Conciliation Board. You will see that we have framed it absolutely on the free-will of all parties. It disclaims all coercion and offers only a voluntary intervention." And after success on the part of Dr. Walsh (May 28th, 1890): "You have won a great place among the people in every class, and you have set

London Strike of 1889

the Church where it ought to be. These strikes have been providential, and the action of the German Emperor and of the Holy Father have created a new world of thoughts and influences."

Manning's social action had borne a steady influence in Rome, and Pope Leo was watching as well as meditating. The great Encyclical on Labour was being steadily matured. Dr. Walsh wrote from Rome (March 24th, 1891): "The Holy Father is in wonderful spirits. After we had gone through the whole Irish Question, we got on the social question and the affairs of the world generally. He spoke at great length to me about the coming Encyclical. He had asked your Eminence to send him a *bravo scrittore* to make the English translation. The Bishop on whom you relied (Dr. Hedley) had left. Then he asked me could I not help him. After a good deal of talk he said that it was to be taken in hand by your Eminence and me. I think I trace your Eminence's influence in many things that I have noted here during this visit. How pleasant a contrast from the state of things here in 1888!" Manning replied (April 12th, 1891): "The Holy Father had accepted the offer of the Bishop of Newport (Benedictine and a very good scholar) to translate it, and he is ready to do so and we can revise it." In May Dr. Walsh brought the Latin text of *Rerum Novarum* personally to London with the Pope's private letter to Manning (May 11th, 1891): "We are profiting by the favourable opportunity of Mgr. Walsh returning to Ireland through London to send you the Latin text of the Encyclical on the Social Question and the Workmen, that you already expect. You will occupy yourself diligently making the English version with great fidelity and accuracy. We desire you to arrange with Mgr. Walsh for the simultaneous publication of the document in England and Ireland. We send you word that the English edition is to serve for its circulation in America also and it will be therefore necessary to send some thousands of copies to Cardinal Gibbons . . .—LEO PP. XIII."

Cardinal Manning and the

The Encyclical, which could certainly count the dock strike in its ancestry, was awaited with unusual interest in Labour as well as in Church circles. The secular press stood to attention and Manning plied Mr. Stead (May 15th, 1891): "The Encyclical reached me on Wednesday night and is now being translated. A copy shall come at once to you when it is in print. You are right, the Catholic Church is the greatest moral force in the world, and its head is the man who is most hated and most loved of any man living. Who but he could publish an Encyclical for which the world of newspapers are besieging me, and the world of Capital and Labour are waiting? It is very good, comprehensive and just, full of sympathy with the world of Labour. It gives, of course, principles rather than solutions." (May 25th, 1891): "Do not attempt any translation of your own. It could only end in confusion. The Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Newport and I were all day yesterday revising it." (June 2nd, 1891): "Being for all men and everywhere it was inevitably in generals. But implicitly it contains everything."

The Encyclical was impartially translated, Hedley taking the Conservative and Manning the Progressive side. For instance, Manning insisted on using the word "strike" and not a euphemism, for the Encyclical laid down that a strike could be justifiable. The relations of the Catholic Church and Democratic Labour were never closer. Tillett wrote to the Cardinal (June 9th, 1891): "I have just been reading the Pope's letter. A very courageous one indeed, one that will test good Catholics much more effectively than any exhortation to religious worship. As you know, some of us would disagree very strongly with many of the strictures laid upon Socialists. These are minor matters. The Catholic sympathy abounds in a generous strength. I hardly think our Protestant prelates would dare utter such wholesome doctrine."

It was a time of hope and progress when the Abbé Lemire could point out that "a Manning among the

London Strike of 1889

London strikers, a Walsh among the Irish evicted and a Gibbons among the Knights of Labour, in offering a loyal hand to Democracy, sealed an alliance which would prove the salvation of the future." Catholic Democracy had come at last and lifted itself upon the wings of the English-speaking Churches. The Latin Catholics had distinctly failed to turn the tide of 1848 to the strength or progress of the Church. They had rather been overwhelmed with Pius, and though Leo sought to rally Catholics in France at least to the new order, it was to American, English and Irish prelates that he looked, when launching the *Rerum Novarum* upon a social movement, which, unless guided, threatened to sweep away the landmarks of the Nineteenth Century.

SHANE LESLIE.

ROMAN MEMORIES OF 1870

TO watchers of the skies a year like 1870, which opened with an Œcumenical Council sitting in Rome, could not seem other than marked for great good or evil ; and so it came about. I have called that year a sort of " grand climacteric," or culmination to the Nineteenth Century. It saw the fall of Napoleon, and with him of France ; the entry of Italians into Rome, which brought down the Temporal Power ; the rise of Prussia to Imperial height, although Wilhelm was not proclaimed Kaiser at Versailles until January 18th, 1871 ; and the Vatican Council. What was decided then in the world of politics lasted on for a whole generation. And the half-century now complete makes a drama with plot, persons, and *dénouement*, which leaves in men of my age the sense of an art consummately handled by an artist unseen. The Roman debates, which were concluded on the very eve of war amid thunder and lightning, might have been guided by prophetic vision ; if they exalted the Pope, the Twentieth of September isolated him as in a prison or a shrine ; and the Vatican was henceforth become a place of pilgrimage to one whose dominion, altogether spiritual, could not be violated, whatever Governments did. Rule by opinion is, in effect, the rule of democracy, being free and individual. Pius IX, last of the Pontiffs who were kings, dying a free man by virtue of the Christian idea which he, so to speak, embodied and expressed, became the sovereign type of a new order of things. He could not fall as Napoleon fell ; neither could Prince Bismarck subdue him by any *Kulturkampf*. His tragic story opened the way for Leo XIII, from *Crux de Cruce* to *Lumen in Coelo*. As the Catholic Church bears visibly onward the ark of God's covenant with man, I perceive that the Council of the Vatican is central, not only among Councils, but in relation to the whole warp and web of the time we have lived through. Once you have recognized religion

Roman Memories

as voluntary obedience to a ruler not born but chosen, whose power is indeed God-given but to be owned by an act of faith, by loyal and personal adhesion, what will you think of dynasties founded on birth, or of empires won by conquest? Let fifty years pass, and then look round. From the Yellow Sea to the Atlantic not an empire is left. America, North and South, is Republican. The Holy Roman Empire can be descried no more; but the Holy Roman people are, confessedly, thanks to their hold on Christian realities and their refusal to betray humanity by anti-Christian practices, the hope of the world.

So I read the past, which is now rounded into a ring—a perfect work of art. To have known it in every stage was no slight privilege; I am glad that I lived in old Papal Rome and at the English College before the change and during the very crisis of Council and Temporal Power; there was a touching grace in our visits to Pius IX, secluded within Vatican walls, beyond which lay the Eternal City where he would nevermore be seen. And yet the people loved him. It was not the Romans who did that work of spoliation. But when we wandered round St. Peter's on December 8th, 1869, a dull and rainy winter's day, to get a glimpse of the procession in which, as though it were a moving pageant, all the Catholic hierarchy passed along, we might have been viewing some vast fresco, dimmed by age, exceedingly rich in its mingled tones, solemn as a Last Judgment. Only one bishop of those seven hundred survives, the Cardinal of Baltimore, who was the youngest on the roll. An era was ending; we talked of Gallicans and Ultramontanes; but the real question had been raised by the Syllabus of 1864—would modern society bow to the yoke of Christ or crucify Him afresh in His true believers? The Council, in eight months, held four public sessions: at Easter we received the definitions which dealt with Nature and Revelation—or, to sum the matter in a pregnant word, with Monism; on July 18th, the dogma of Papal Infallibility was declared. Next day the Franco-

Roman Memories

Prussian War broke out. Never again could the Council meet ; its essential task, however, had been done. For it told the world what Catholics believed concerning God and His creation ; it proclaimed the Church to be its own evidence ; and it acknowledged St. Peter's successor as the divinely-appointed guardian of St. Peter's faith.

In this large undertaking our masters at the Roman College bore a part, chiefly by way of preparation and counsel, which, however momentous, did not bring them on the public stage. Men like Franzelin, Perrone, Kleutgen, Schrader, Palmieri, were students or experts, not statesmen or politicians ; they drew up schemata—rough drafts which were severely handled in debate by brilliant speakers, whom it was not their place to answer. Nevertheless, when we review the dogmatic Constitutions, *Dei Filius* and *Pastor Æternus*, it is in substance their work that we see before us. The vehement discussions to which the vaulted roofs of the Basilica rang—sometimes in our hearing while we prayed at the golden lights of the Confession—turned, I believe, rather on history or policy than on the dogmas themselves. With policy the Roman College had no concern ; and my feeling, when I first attended lectures in those lofty classrooms adorned with portraits of the great Jesuit theologians, was that history, taken for granted, would not occupy much of the professor's time or of ours. All, I might say, was idea, was *a priori*, deductive and legal, in the teaching of doctrine, despite an admirable knowledge of Aristotelian methods. But the inductive, experimental spirit of Aristotle must be sought elsewhere. History, whether of philosophy, of the Church, or of dogma, which my German reading had set down as indispensable means to a genuine acquaintance with our respective subject-matters, we might study for ourselves ; the Chair was a Chair of exposition and argument, not of research. Or, to point my phrase by allusion to events which had recently made no small stir, the Roman College was not, neither did it wish to be, a Munich Congress. An outward sign of this difference was that Lord Acton

Roman Memories

came to Rome, while Doellinger did not; the layman could organize an opposition on the ground of history which he had made his own; but as doctor of divinity—well, even W. G. Ward, who kept clear of dogmatic theses beyond ethics and cognate themes, found his teaching at St. Edmund's give scandal to some excellent Catholics, not as though he taught error but because he was not a priest. Franzelin or Schrader took one line, Doellinger took another, in the method of building up the Catholic creed. We may contrast them as the "positive" and the "critical"; yet an illustrious German, Moehler, too soon called away, had united both in his great masterpiece, the "Symbolik." The consequences of a dispute, surely admitting of explanation upon Moehler's principles, were melancholy; but I need not dwell upon them. When Lord Acton said that he had never doubted any article of the Faith—and we may be sure he meant what he affirmed—the inference I draw is that some perverse misunderstanding came between Rome and Munich, due very much to casting the claims of science into a dogmatic form which, as regards human facts or history, is alien to it. Other motives gave energy to the combatants; this was the purely intellectual issue. But from the pulpit of the Roman College we never heard it mentioned, so far as I now call to mind.

The mental atmosphere, in fact, had not been changed since the days of Suarez or Toletus, although Franzelin spent great zeal in refuting the condemned opinions of Hermes and Günther—the men as well as their writings unknown to his audience, except for a dozen Teutons, it may be, among three hundred Italians, Latin-Americans, Hungarians, Belgians, Scots, and English. Franzelin, himself a Tyrolese, who had taught in Graz and elsewhere, was in 1870 the acknowledged prince of theologians; but how little like a prince did that saintly man appear! I cannot well imagine him in the Cardinal's robes with which by and by the Holy Father invested him. Nothing of Italian grace or French stateliness might be discerned in figure, attitude, or voice while he lectured, always

Roman Memories

earnestly, with an undertone of spiritual fervour, in his German Latin, moving slowly through sentences which found no end, or found it after long endeavour. He seemed at all times weary ; and suffering, as we know now he did, from the disease of conscience termed scrupulosity, the wonder is that he held out so many seasons without relief, immersed in the work of Roman Congregations, and treating himself austerely. Professor of Oriental languages, he never alluded to the East or quoted Hebrew ; but, somewhat a rare thing in the case of scholastic divines, he was mighty in the Scriptures, though hardly ever touching on problems of criticism. Altogether, being a man of genius completely unaffected by any modern influence, I may say that for this pure unworldly spirit time stood still. To us who heard and saw him only at lecture he was a voice ; at the best a great light ; but to the end a stranger.

These masters of so many thousands of young men held their disciples at a distance, made no attempt outside the Schools to shape life or thought, and relinquished to the College authorities what is significantly called discipline. They were not our friends. Neither, again, did the superiors of the English College in my time show the faintest personal interest in us, or our studies, or our future. Beyond a code of teasing regulations, wasted on youths who lived in a strict and almost monastic routine, we had a singular kind of liberty, following upon the perfect neglect which directed none of our reading but abandoned us to the Roman College and our own will. I am not sorry that so it was. Under a cast-iron system, beloved of mediocrity, one would have been forbidden to read Goethe, to remember the Greek poets, to learn worldly wisdom from Thackeray. Cramming for "public acts," the conquest of medals, would then have seemed "the be-all and the end-all" of our sojourn in Rome. At another College this narrow programme put English literature simply on the Index ; and prizes fell in abundance to the gifted fellows who were thus driven, as between blinkers, to victory. We took few prizes at that

Roman Memories

period of the Venerabile ; and our Italian tutors fell into despair when we dealt out to them a certain ironical treatment which made light of the learning (merely formal repetition, it is true) they offered and we disdained. This comedy went on of itself, always with unfailing good humour ; but our innocent ineffective guides would have felt even more puzzled if they happened to be told how much serious reading, what lively discussions, and what intensity of metaphysical reflection, such apparent indifference concealed. I am afraid that we from the North have earned a very singular fame, as of persons measurable to Southerners neither by rule nor compass, thanks to our inveterate refusal to fall in with conventions abroad. It is an old story, as new after all these centuries to the Roman world as when the house in Via Monserrato began its chequered chronicles. The Eternal City was our university, the College our hostel ; and I who, by nature, breeding, dedication, was a born student, felt pure delight when the notice-board on the Jesuit portals announced, "*Scholae vacant*," "holiday to-day."

Yet who with any mind, attending lectures and getting headaches in the ill-ventilated rooms which were soon to be seized from us by the Piedmontese, could fail to admire the force of intellect revealed when Ballerini was bringing his judgment, ripened by experience, to bear on the problems of casuistry ? or when Palmieri recited, in unchanging tones, from outspread sheets the dissertations he had composed on St. Augustine, Jansenism, and the quarrel *De Auxiliis* ? Listening to Palmieri we understood how St. Thomas might be held the Angel of the Schools. Outward appearance did not count ; emotion never coloured an accent ; the voice, clear in every syllable, lasted precisely one hour, then stopped, to begin and end to-morrow as it had this morning. Palmieri was indeed a "separated intelligence," calm as the absolute zero, his mere procedure an education in pure reason. To know the contrast of methods which are both equally convincing in the setting forth of identical

Roman Memories

subjects, I would lay on one table the entirely unimpassioned "Treatise on Actual Grace" that was dealt out to us much as though Boscovich were expounding his dynamical theory of matter, and the first four volumes of Sainte-Beuve on *Port-Royal*. In the French view persons and personality are everything; but personality became an abstract idea when our Jesuit Angel took it for consideration. Ballerini had to decide concrete and real issues; by tradition, the moral professor cultivates humour; he is *der lustige*, the jester, of the Schools; and this tall, bent old man of Bologna, white-haired, wrinkle-faced, with glowering eyes and a large smile, was by temperament a humorist. He kept warm an ancient feud with Rosmini, whose whole system he had violently assailed. The name never dropped from his lips; but in the curiously rugged Latin of more than one paragraph within his edition of Gury we may discover certain shrewd thrusts at the moralist of Rovereto. There was something breezy and Aristophanic about this genial jester; compared with his fellows, who lectured but never thought of laughing, let me boldly say that he walked and talked as one *inter mortuos liber*, and his vivacity kept us alive. He had passions no less than parts; a superb vocabulary, Latin and Italian, of scorn, of indignation, of sarcastic wit; and a philosophy which was proof against exile in early days, and now against the shameful confiscation of which the Society became the victim soon after the new Government plumped down with their officials on Rome. He went out gaily, muttering, "Itur a refectorio in refectorium," "From dining-room to dining-room we go." For the sake of Ballerini, had he known him, Sainte-Beuve would, I can fancy, have given the Society of Jesus at least a partial indulgence. Never was there a Jesuit so little corresponding to the legend of the dissembler, the polite assassin, the plague that walketh in darkness. To a multitude of priests in many countries the Roman College meant Ballerini, not without pleasant cause.

Such as these, then, were the agents employed by the

Roman Memories

Holy See in drawing up schemes of Canon Law and doctrine for the Council. Their work was tried as by fire; the stubble perished; and when Connolly, Archbishop of Halifax, flung away the first draft, crying aloud "Sepeliatur," the stroke must have gone to Franzelin's heart. Nevertheless, amendment of Bills is the very essence of Parliamentary debate; and what was the meeting of the world's bishops but a Church Parliament? By and by, Kleutgen won general applause with his preamble, written in great haste, to the Constitution *Dei Filius*, of which Lord Acton observes that "several of the Jesuits obtained credit for the ability and moderation with which the decree was drawn up." Acton is severe upon the uncompromising Clement Schrader, as I can well understand, having in remembrance that professor's lectures on St. Luke's Gospel—the most pedantic and unprofitable it was ever my fortune to endure. This very gentlemanlike Hanoverian, careful in speech and appearance, was a Ciceronian of the school of Passaglia, whose colleague he had been. His abilities were undoubted, his logic went straight forward, without making allowance for human nature in things that concern it more than pure mathematics; and given all this, I need hardly say that extreme conclusions did not frighten him. To critics of the Syllabus and opponents of the papal claims, men of this quality are at once welcome and detestable, as affording a reduction to the absurd of the positions where they lie entrenched. I contrast him with Perrone, the amiable shrewdly-judging old man, who verified his logic by observation of the freedom allowed in Catholic schools to so many groups of orthodox teachers. Mediocrity, which was all that Perrone claimed for his writings, is sometimes golden. I think with pleasure of Newman's generous words about him; and count among my happy memories that I was examined by him for my degree and holy orders.

Everyone that has lived long under the shadow of St. Peter's will have been aware of the deep feeling which led Byron to exclaim, "O Rome, my country, city of the

Roman Memories

soul"—for it becomes not only familiar but kind, with a genial warmth and intimacy, a large tolerance, and endless attractions, from classical and mediæval to the sights and events of the day. We young men belonging to a papal college enjoyed by virtue of our uniform the privileges of court dress; all doors were open to us, and after witnessing the full round of the papal year inside the Vatican Basilica, or at other churches, we seemed like children at home, noting the guests as they now arrived from the four winds to begin this œcumenical campaign. For there was to be fighting, as of old at Ephesus and Chalcedon. The crowd of bishops broke into groups; leaders appeared; and we soon came to know those who were making fame by their words and acts, however secret the debates might be reckoned. Of real secrecy there could be little. Among the prelates some took their own view regarding it, and gave information regularly to certain journals; others, as the Archbishop of Westminster records, were, by his counsel to the Holy Father, set free, so that a true account of what went on should reach the European statesmen, whose policy was yet undetermined. We of the English College saw our own bishops day by day; several were guests in the house; and Dr. Grant, of Southwark, venerated in Rome as a saint, died there. I call to mind the visit which Pius IX paid to him not long before the end came. As his manner was, the Pope remarked on all he saw; cast a glance at Wolsey's portrait among the English Cardinals in our gallery, observing, "Non era un buon pezzo quello" ("Hardly a saint, that one!"), and stood on the stone stairs a moment to refer—I know not why—to "the principles of '89." It was an event in one's life to hear the Roman Pontiff utter those words, with which and their implications he had been dealing ever since he put on the triple crown. Authority, divine and human, was at stake; the Vatican, the Mount of Prophecy, would now reply to Rousseau with his *Social Contract*. There stood, smiling down upon us youths, a most engaging old man, still firm and vigorous, the "Servant of the

Roman Memories

Servants of God " by divine right ; and his claims must be admitted for the good of mankind.

I am giving, in sentences like these, my own convictions, which fell in gladly with all I read in De Maistre, in Manning, and in Ward—to quote names of the first eminence during 1870. When, five years later, I became a guest of Dr. Ward's at Weston Manor, and contributed my first articles to the DUBLIN REVIEW, one of the links which bound us together was my acquaintance with nearly all he had written on the papal prerogatives, which somewhat surprised him in so young a man. But I had been following his arguments and discussions, quarter by quarter, since 1866. For Joseph de Maistre my affectionate admiration has been life-long, although naturally differing from his creed of a noble caste, entrusted by Providence with care of mankind. He saw deep into the French Revolution, its essence and dangers, being schooled to that in some degree by Edmund Burke. A lover of epigrams might tell us that he "discovered the Pope for the Nineteenth Century"; and the Vatican Council which extinguished Gallicanism drew its governing or platonic idea of the Papacy from his volumes. I learned them by heart ; I find a charm, that is to say, the persuasive power that resides in something more than logic yet is eminently reasonable, in his pages still. How much did the convert Archbishop of Westminster owe to them ? Directly, not a great deal, I suppose ; but ideas take wings and fly abroad, especially in times charged like our last century with revolution waiting to become, as we have been taught by stern experience, and are yet learning, the law of all nations. It is a piercing observation of Newman's that H. E. Manning's views were apocalyptic, and presaged the world's end. Such was the prelate's message in print and in speech, terrifying to mild Inopportunists, if we will accept the report of Canon Moufang, who heard him in Rome abounding on such millennial topics. For Manning, in 1870, the last hour of European institutions had struck. Hours on the dial of time are counted by years ; but his forecast did come true ; it is

Roman Memories

showing itself more and more to be the truth. Gallicans, Old Catholics, were just survivals ; the School of Munich held a thesis of far-reaching importance, but had no philosophy which was adequate to its real demands—it had only criticism, no vision. If development be the law of dogma, then apocalypse with its battles of dark and light powers is the one philosophy and the revealed code of history. Manning's eyes were opened to the supreme issue.

As from early years frequenting St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater, I felt Manning's influence all about me ; in Rome he appeared with a dignity no less edifying than splendid. We hung upon his words, so choice and polished rather than oratorical, enhanced by a presence and a winning expression which even those who would not yield to him recognized. Myself, I was never, strictly speaking, his disciple. I had been brought up on temperance and the old English liberal views—a combination which was to make him famous in later years ; but I did not learn these from him. During the Council he preached in our College chapel, but Catholic Rome and not the question of the day furnished the text. Everyone knew how demonic (to borrow the word which he accepted with a grim smile) were his activities in and outside the Council. He found a strong British team against him, led by Errington and Clifford. My own bishop, W. B. Ullathorne, moving among purple-clad prelates in his dark Benedictine habit, would never join private coteries, nor did he put himself in front, though his vote *juxta modum* on a matter in which he proved successful, was interpreted by Odo Russell as a passing over to the Opposition. Once he rebuked Mgr. Mermillod for a harsh word, and with justice ; but on the whole his attitude was one of reserve. He, too, preached at Sant' Andrea della Valle ; and a remarkable sermon, deep and strong ; yet much excelled by the rare little discourses I have heard from his lips at ordinations, perfect in form and feeling. This is not the place to enlarge on the characteristics of a man whose unusual career added to

Roman Memories

a real and sturdy kind of genius made for him a niche in the story of the Catholic Revival quite his own. He was a true monk, and to the solitude of the cloister he brought the spirit of a traveller by sea and land, the silence of a meditative soul. There was about him something antique, not modern or fitting in with a plan of campaign, drawn up whether by Manning or Acton. To the Holy See none could be more loyal, "I obey you, love you, and most honour you," he would have said to Pius IX; then have left the discussion to those who delighted in it.

Well-matched the combatants were. On us young men Dupanloup made little impression or none at all, though his name sounded loud as originator of the Vatican Council, and we knew of him by the witty summing up of his pamphlet on Pope Honorius, "*Petrus negavit, et statim gallus cantavit.*" A bellicose prelate, Freppel of Angers, had challenged us who were by residence and habit Romans, in a public disputation with an arrogant "*Nos Galli,*" "We French are of opinion"; and the double-edged word lent itself to sarcasm. It was true that in the crisis of 1867 Dupanloup had saved the Temporal Power, thus giving time for the Council in which Gallicanism would meet its end. The soldiers of Napoleon, mixed with papal volunteers, might be seen at every corner; yet neither the people nor the Vatican had any pleasure in the occupation which left the Roman question unsolved. There is a deep contrariety between the French and the Italian temperament, almost beyond reconciling; it came out strongly when Dupanloup served as a spearhead to the Opposition in the Council Chamber; and his resuscitation of the Four Articles of 1682 provoked a feeling as though Louis XIV were once more inflicting an outrage in Rome itself on the Holy See. The dispute had been long domestic among French Catholics, between the heirs of Bossuet and the aftergrowths of De Maistre and Lamennais; now it was raging under St. Peter's Home. I do not pretend to grasp the motives or the policy of this high-minded and generous man, who suffered during the double occupation of

Roman Memories

Orleans by the Germans a penance, let us call it, more than sufficient to atone for his failure in the spring of 1870 to discern the signs of the times. French bishops, preaching at San Luigi in the Corso, took a variety of topics; my memory still glows with lights from the eloquence of Cardinal Pie; and after fifty years I am sensible of the taking beauty in language and gesture which gave to Mermillod's periods their distinction amid other fine examples of Christian oratory.

A contrast bordering on the absolute we found in Isaac Hecker, the German-American, convert, missionary, and mystic, who showed his striking figure on the platform of Sant' Andrea, while he poured out a passionate strain, curiously foreign to our hearing, on the spirit of the age. Who could be more removed than he from Gallican or Febronian provincialism? But his new world was not the old. Am I fanciful in detecting between this Catholic priest devoted to his Church and the poet of the people, Walt Whitman, a resemblance as of brothers? He seemed a bird of passage from seas afar off, Western, and announcing the dawn of to-morrow beyond the sunset. America was attending a General Council for the first time—America, the destined heir of us all. His sermon, valiantly delivered in an accent we could not mistake, was aimed at Immanuel Kant; with intense conviction he pleaded for the ever-living influence of the Holy Spirit in the Church—briefly, against what men called thirty-five years later Modernism. Admirable Father Hecker, some of whose writings I knew, and whom I compared to that inspiring Dominican, Lacordaire! But the preacher did not dream of troubles destined to arise about his life and doctrine. Nor did I, listening to him in the crowd, forecast that to me would fall the honourable task of writing a sketch in this DUBLIN REVIEW of that Life which would enjoy a wide circulation among Americans. Almost a quarter of a century afterwards I became the guest of his brother-Paulists in New York, where I preached from the pulpit he had occupied. There was no heresy in the soul of Isaac Hecker, concerning whom Cardinal Newman

Roman Memories

wrote to Father Hewit in February, 1889, on receiving intelligence of his death, "I have ever felt that there was this sort of unity in our lives, that we had both begun a work of the same kind, he in America and I in England; and I know how zealous he was in promoting it." His intimate friend and disciple, J. J. Keane, who was Rector of Washington University when I stayed there—and I came to be well acquainted with him by and by in Rome, whence he removed to be Archbishop of Dubuque—was frequent in pointing out Hecker's central principle; the synthesis, namely, of letter and spirit, of authority with inward grace and divine light, which constituted as in a sacrament of unity the Catholic Church. This was the spiritual freedom he rejoiced in; his message to America was its application along all the lines of the coming age.

Very fruitful, I think, would it be, time and space permitting, to bring under one view the Western idea thus shadowed forth by Hecker, and the Central European which, confronted by diversities of races, states, and sects, was animated by a desire for reconciliation all round—unity of churches and empires, with as much as might be of Home Rule, so long as the supreme Government held good. The Opposition, so far as it was German or Hungarian, laid great stress on considerations of which the object was peace, and first of all between professing Christians. Doellinger, in *The Church and the Churches*, made an appeal accordingly, not without power. But at the Council this eirenic impulse became an attack on official routine; and the storm-compeller was a bishop from the marches of Austria, by name Strossmayer. If Manning dominated in the ecclesiastical world, it is hardly too much to say that this man of war, who moved about with his retinue like a prince, drew the eyes of all Rome. By extraction a German, high in the Court of Vienna, his sympathies were yet on the side of the Southern Slavs, and from Agram-Zagreb he looked towards the Russian Church with longings for reunion. His learning could hold but a rushlight to Doellinger's

Roman Memories

inexhaustible erudition ; but it was real, of a kind not much cultivated among Italians, and offered to the Fathers (who did not always welcome it) in a most eloquent and classic Latin. His chivalrous bearing went with a kind heart. Born in 1815 he survived, like Doellinger, to the great age of ninety, dying in 1905. It is pleasant now to construe this very remarkable man by the light of an heroic career, during which he proved himself such a friend to the oppressed Slavs of the Dual Empire that they revere him as not only their champion but herald and founder of the freedom which, in the "kingdom of Serbs, Slovenes, and Croatians," is guaranteed to them. In science, art, and general culture, he did much and spent munificently to advance his people, who will never forget the part he took in helping on their deliverance. Towards the Uniate Churches he anticipated the policy of Leo XIII, which I have likened to Home Rule. We can have small difficulty in understanding how a spirit so resolute, a breaker into the forest and pioneer of new paths, should amaze, or even scandalize, the permanent secretaries whom he faced and occasionally browbeat in St. Peter's. Peace to the combatants ! "They are all gone into the world of light" ; and the Holy Father's long-suffering with Strossmayer, as with his *fidus Achates*, Hefele of Rottenburg, was rewarded. Both in due course published the decrees. Not a single bishop of the Opposition attempted to rend the Church by schism. Their departure on the eve of July 18th, 1870, must be honoured as an act of regard for conscience while deferring to the papal dignity and leaving the Council intact. The unity of Catholicism received immediately during stress of war a profound homage from these very men who had spoken their minds and, as the tired stenographers declared, exhausted all arguments in a discussion worn threadbare. Cardinal Franzelin's doctrine of the three stages in development—aboriginal faith, tumultuous controversy, and final agreement—sums up the story of the Vatican Council.

Among the Roman Fathers who were to preside over it

Roman Memories

we knew more than one personally ; but our protector, Cardinal Reisach, died before he could take his seat, in December, 1869. I saw him first in the playing-fields of Oscott College, one summer afternoon in 1866, when he was travelling about England by commission, on the subject of Oxford and University studies. An exile from Bavaria, where he had censured the King because of Lola Montes, and had thereby lost the Archbishopric of Munich-Freising, he enjoyed the highest consideration at the Vatican ; his German birth and Roman experience seemed to point him out as acceptable to all parties in the Council ; but his days expended *in laboribus plurimis* had worn him down. He passed ; and I remember listening in a dreadfully cold church near the Aventine to as frigid a sermon on this text, delivered by one of those curious Italian preachers whose rhetoric is all grimace and *floriture*. "A Cardinal ought to die in Rome," says the proverb ; if so, it would be well to forbid any funeral discourse, as likely to be wanting in the one touch of nature. Cardinal Reisach did not understand the English genius ; and he knew nothing of the English College except what he had been misleadingly told. The same was true of Mgr. Vitelleschi who came after him. We liked much better the Sicilian, Cardinal di Luca, which was the case with many English Catholics to whom he showed kindness. A small, dark-featured man, learned in languages, affable and of good judgment, he had exercised in Sicily some office connected with the Inquisition which brought him across the Carbonari. Secret societies have tenacious memories ; and when certain of his former delinquents entered Rome in triumph on September 20th, Cardinal di Luca thought it advisable to take refuge with us in the Via Monserrato. We found him agreeable and not nervous about himself ; from his lips we heard an account of the morning in the Vatican where he had been present with the Corps Diplomatique in attendance on the Holy Father. It was the last morning of a Temporal Dominion which could count eleven centuries to its credit. Sixty-four days after the defini-

Roman Memories

tion of Papal Infallibility the end had come. Surely when we looked up from our watch-tower of the English College, and beheld the immense white flag of parley waving above St. Peter's in a cloudless blue sky, we might have said to one another, "This is a great play with a magnificent curtain." The third Italy was claiming the Third Rome. But that tragic end was also a beginning. For in a deeper sense than Virgil could have divined, his words, ascribed to the Supreme, are true of the papal prospects :

"His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono ;
Imperium sine fine dedi."

WILLIAM BARRY.

THE MONK'S CHANT

O THAT I might sink into that deep pool,
Ardent with desire of His burning rule :
In His chastening fire, O that I might sink !
O that I might fall through the severing clouds,
Into that deep pool through the sevenfold shrouds :
Ardent for His rule, O that I might fall,
O that I might rest ! as a sleeping child
Feebly in His hands, all my love up-piled !
O'er the arid sands O that I might rest !
O that I might weep, wounded to the heart,
Pain in every limb, tortured every part ;
Wounded but by Him, O that I might weep !
O that I might lie in one precious scar,
Be but soothing balm where I once did mar :
In His holy palm O that I might lie !

EVAN MORGAN.

SYON ABBEY,

1420-1920

THERE was purple and ermine and gold, and the royal hands of Henry V, the hero of Agincourt, laid the foundation stone of Syon Abbey on February 22nd, 1415. Stone was still mounting upon stone in 1468.

Fathers and Sisters had come from Vasteen in Sweden. Princes and prelates had led them to the shores of their native land and wished them God speed. England's king had welcomed them, and amidst kingly smiles and kingly splendour they began their lives of prayer and praise around the altar throne of the King of kings. The first English professions were received by Archbishop Chicheley of Canterbury, on April 21st, 1420. In the following year Bishop Clifford, of London, confirmed the election of Dame Joan North as Abbess, and Sir Thomas Fyschburne as Confessor-General. For over one hundred years this school of God's love continued to work and pray, and men and women passed out into the great world of heaven. Kings came and went, and begged for prayers and left their lands, until Henry VIII was on the throne and John Fewterer was Confessor-General. *Quae sunt Caesaris, Caesaris, et quae sunt Dei, Deo*; it was God's examination day. Bishops, priests and monks, Lords and Commons, fell reluctantly, but they fell. Learning and cowardice interchanged scruples; love was very cold, and Christ seemed to be standing very near the gallows tree. All the same, Father Richard of Syon faced the glance of His eyes and smiled.

And the Abbey: "The Confessor there, and some other of the wisest of the brethren, the Abbas and all her religious susters, like good, wise and feythful ladys to our soveraine Lord, be wel contended with the Kinges Grace said title, and wolbe redy to declare thair consentes to the same when so ever, they shall be required; as I

Syon Abbey

am now informed, and as I also perceyved meself, when I was at Sion.”*

Of course there were stubborn Sisters and stubborn Brethren, and the Abbess and Confessor-General had much trouble between them all, but Bedyll was tactful, and although there were “diverse of the Friryys at Sion, which he mynded to offer thaim self in sacrifice to the great idole of Rome,”† when the time came Richard Reynolds stood alone with Thomas Brownel, lay-brother, for company. Reynolds was taken to the Tower where he met the three Carthusian priors and the parish priest of Isleworth. Here they all made “the good Confession,” and Sir Thomas More waved farewell as they mounted the hurdles for Tyburn (May 4th, 1535). All the world was awaiting their arrival at the gallows. The rope was ready and the knife was sharp “. . . and Reynolds, being the last that was executed and seeing them cruelly quartered, and their bowels taken out, preached unto them and comforted them, promising them a heavenly banquet and supper, for the sharp breakfast taken patiently for their Master’s sake. He never changed colour nor was disquieted, and then in the end, lastly went to die manfully himself.”‡

Thomas Brownel followed his brother some two years afterwards. He died “in defense of ye Catholic Faith”§ consumed by the filth of Newgate, October 21st, 1537. In 1539 Syon Abbey was suppressed and pensioned. The Abbess retired with a few monks and nuns to Denham. She died there *in osculo Christi*, 1546. Others of the Community, realizing that it was impossible to serve both God and the king, left England for Flanders, under the leadership of Catherine Palmer. Henry went from woman to woman until death came. On the way from London to Windsor, the king’s body rested at the sometime royal Abbey. The coffin broke and dogs licked the

* Bedyll to Secretary Cromwell, Aug. 28th, 1534. From Cromwell’s correspondence in the Chapter House, Bundle B. Letter in full in Aungier’s *History of Syon Monastery*. † *Ibid.*!

‡ Arundel MS. 152. Quoted by Dom Bede Camm, *Lives of the English Martyrs*. § Syon *Obit.* book.

Syon Abbey

red blood from the stones of Syon (1547). In 1555, Cardinal Pole returned to reconcile England to Christ and His Church. On his way thither, the Papal Legate visited the exiles. Syon Abbey was Crown land again, and Philip and Mary willingly returned it. The Community was solemnly reinclosed by the last Catholic Bishop of London, and by the last Abbot of Westminster on August 1st, 1557.

The new dawn was fingered with rosy glory, but it was the glory of Palm Sunday. Mary died and Elizabeth reigned (1558), Syon Abbey was Crown land once more and the Community was glad to hurry out of England under the protection of the Spanish Ambassador. Their wanderings commenced in Flanders; Dermond to Zurich Zee, Zurich Zee to Meshagan near Antwerp; hence, in the nick of time, they escaped to Mechlin. Elizabeth saw to it that they were very poor, and her spies allowed very little money to slip through their fingers. At Mechlin troubles were renewed; the nuns were accused of concealing munitions in the convent. The Lutherans stirred up the mob; the house was pillaged, and the Abbess, Catherine Palmer, died from the shock. The King of Spain had been their benefactor, but the Netherlands were in successful revolt and the annuity did not arrive; and through all the spirit of St. Bridget still lived on. It was decided to send some of the Sisters to England to beg. They went, and Elizabeth gave them an Elizabethan welcome in her prisons. One of the nuns, Sister Elizabeth Saunders, has left a record of her experiences in a letter to Sir Francis Englefield. She was brought before many Justices. To all their questions she answered that she "was a woman and a nun, that the first reason was proof enough that I would not disturb the kingdom, and the second would let them know that I was a Catholic, as they have no nuns in their sect."* They tried to get her to church, and fine mounted

* Given by Yepen in his *Historia Particular de la Persecucion de Inglaterra*. Translation of letter by Dom Adam Hamilton, O.S.B., in *Poor Souls' Friend* (Burns & Oates), Feb., March, April, 1894.

Syon Abbey

upon fine. Having no money to pay she was sentenced to imprisonment for life. She escaped, but was scrupulous about having done so, and returned to prison. Meanwhile the Sisters at Mechlin continued to serve God with watchings and fastings. Their plight was piteous, and it was "Tommy" who came to the rescue. He was quartered at Mechlin at the time, helping the Lutherans. But Luther or no Luther, these nuns were his countrywomen, and religion or no religion, he was a man, so when he thought the Lutherans were after the Sisters, "Tommy" ran round and the Lutherans ran away, and, finally, "Tommy" escorted them down to Antwerp at the peril of his life. The Sisters left Antwerp by sea and, in spite of English pirates, arrived safely at Rouen, 1580. Sister Elizabeth Saunders rejoined them here. Having conquered her scruples, she made her way to France disguised as a countrywoman. Her companions from Mechlin never returned, God having accounted them worthy "to suffer more for the Catholic Faith."*

It was at Rouen that Father Foster came to Syon. His mother died in a York prison "a monstrous Papist,"† confessing the faith to the end, and her dead hands clasped the last will and testament, in which she dared any minister to touch her body. She was buried by her husband in the tomb of the martyred Earl of Northumberland. Father Foster had been educated at Douai and Rome. He had been Professor at Rheims. He had made his retreat with the Jesuits and was going to England. All the Fathers of Syon were dead, Lady Abbess pressed, God seemed to call, Cardinal Allen agreed, and so Father Foster stayed at Rouen and became Confessor-General (1584). Meanwhile the English were on the look out for him at Dover and Rye. Nothing daunted, it seems that their agents administered poison to him at Rouen. He

* Given by Yepen in his *Historia Particular de la Persecucion de Inglaterra*. Translation of letter by Dom Adam Hamilton, O.S.B., in *Poor Souls' Friend* (Burns & Oates), Feb., March, April, 1894.

† Vide ch. iii of *An Account of the Travels, Dangers and Wonderful Deliverances of the English Nuns of the famous Monastery of Sion*. MS. in possession of Syon Abbey, Chudleigh. Original written shortly after arrival at Lisbon. Present MS. copied 1741.

Syon Abbey

was very ill and at the point of death, but recovered.

The convent was in great difficulties ; however, more Fathers joined up, and in 1589 the municipal authorities gave the Community a house and the people built them a church. Fathers Vivian and Marsh were sent to Spain to fetch the King's bounty. On the return journey the Huguenots caught them at La Rochelle, relieved them of their cash, and finally gave them as a present to English pirates. The latter paraded the poor men through the green lanes of England, as monks, priests and traitors, and handed them over to her Majesty who punished them at her pleasure in the Marshalsea. Father Foster ultimately succeeded in procuring their release and received them as men risen from the dead.

Meanwhile "Hereticks and Politicks" were going ahead in France and Rouen. As early as 1587 there had been trouble. The frost broke forty-four of the city conduits. It was whispered that this was the work of the Bridgettines : "Catholics and English to boot, they had a secret conduit in their cellar and drew thither all the water from the town." Rumour always succeeds ; crowds besieged the monastery and Father Foster had some difficulty in making them believe the evidence of their own senses. Twice the Community endured the horrors of a siege (1589, 1591), notorious among God's enemies, famous among His friends " . . . our soldiers who daily sallied to skirmish with the enemy, came often to us to warn and admonish us to pray, telling us the especial danger we were in, for in the very combats and skirmishes with the enemy, they heard them oftentimes rail against us and no other, threatening us . . . showing our great danger and particular spite against us and desire to destroy us, if ever they should enter the city."* The Earl of Essex and 4,000 English were outside the walls (1591). Inside, "in this time of siege, we had the Orotories and whole concourse of the city, with continuall Sermons, Service and Prayers for the full space of six weeks together. And not only so, but the whole Court

* *Ibid.* ch. xlii.

Syon Abbey

of Parliament, through the like devotion and affection to us, omitted to hear their accustomed Mass in the Parliament Hall and came together in order every Friday, to hear Mass with us . . . and the Councillors of the Court of Parliament . . . and many others were our Father's ghostly children and often conferred with him.*

But there were clouds on the horizon. Lady Abbess Bridget Rooke dreamt she saw Father Foster standing alone, holding up the Pope's Mitre in the midst of the city of Rouen. The Catholic League was failing after all, Henry of Navarre was winning, and everyone wanted to have their cake and eat it too. How was it possible to acknowledge Henry "a publick, notorious excommunicate heretick," as king of France and at the same time escape the papal censures? The Canons of the Cathedral Church of Rouen lost no time, they led the way in treating with the enemy, that they might "receive their rents and ecclesiastical revenues" . . . "that they should begin to do that which the laity as yet did not, being in more want than themselves, was so scandalous a thing,"† that the Pope's Legate at Paris threatened them with excommunication. For more delicately tempered minds the Rector of the Jesuit College wrote a *brochure*, "which treatise so much mangled and limited the (Papal) censures with particular interpretations, suited to the temporizing humour of the deliverer of it, that in reality it made the ensures of no effect."‡ Father Foster wrote a reply, which resulted in the Rector losing his Prefect of Studies and also his temper, but apparently nothing could shake the poor man's resolve to absolve the excommunicate Cardinal of Bourbon, authority or no authority. The Father Rector also "solicited other Religious Priors and Superiors to join with him and to draw a humble letter of submission with a petition to the said king, that he would protect them and not permit them to be despoiled of their

* Vide ch. xiii of *An Account of the Travels, Dangers and Wonderfull Deliverances of the English Nuns of the famous Monastery of Sion*. MS. in possession of Syon Abbey, Chudleigh. Original written shortly after arrival at Lisbon. Present MS. copied 1741.

† *Ibid.*, ch. xxx.

‡ *Ibid.*, ch. xxxiii.

Syon Abbey

houses and goods, with divers other articles to the like purpose, promising to pray for him and be his most loyal subjects.”* The dream had come true. Father Foster was standing alone with the Pope’s Mitre in his hands ; ready to die a martyr if God called him, he strengthened the wavering and confirmed the strong. On Wednesday, in Passion week, 1594, the Governor surrendered the city to Navarre and *Te Deum* was sung in the Cathedral. On Saturday of the same week Father Foster arose from his bed at midnight, rang the bell for his brethren, and all went to the Sisters’ grate. For two hours they prayed ; at the end their decision was taken, they would go to Spain. They left Rouen on Good Friday, April 8th. Crowds besieged the monastery. “The plainer and more religious people lamented, saying : If you who fled to our country for the Catholic Faith go away, alas, what shall we do ? Alas, what change is this ? Others said : You have a fair house and Church and are well beloved, why will you go ? To whom Father Foster answered : We left a better house, a better Church and friends in England, viz., Old Syon in England, a royal foundation. We came to France, not to seek commodities, but to serve God in the Catholic Faith, and to live and die in obedience to the Church of Rome ; to conclude, we neither sought England, France, nor earth, but heaven, which is all we pretend to, and you yourselves and all other Catholics are bound to do the same . . . So taking leave of their Church with a short prayer at the High Altar, they departed with heavy hearts, though strongly resolved for the love of God and in obedience to the See and Church of Rome, they left friends, Church and the well beloved city of Rouen.”† Christ in His Sacrament went with them. On Easter Day Father Foster gave them Holy Communion, just as they were in the boat, moored by Quillebœuf on the Seine. It had been difficult to obtain passports, and when they arrived at Le Havre there was no boat, and when there was a boat there was no money. Their friends were imprisoned, their baggage

* *Ibid.*, ch. xxxiv.

† *Ibid.*, ch. li.

Syon Abbey

searched, and the Governor washed his hands of them. But God did not fail; they secured a Flemish boat at last and set sail on May 5th. More English pirates; the nuns made the "exercise of the Cross" and the Fathers turned seamen. They escaped as by a miracle, and on May 20th, 1594, arrived in the city of Lisbon. Portuguese nuns took them in, Isabel de Azevedo gave them a property and the King of Spain renewed his grant, but the Archbishop was suspicious. They had left Rouen in haste, and their papers were not all in order. Father Parsons, S.J., and Sir Francis Englefield took up their cause, but the Archbishop still demurred. His Council feared the obligations that might arise through the Convent's poverty. The case was taken to Rome, and as a result the Community was placed under the immediate jurisdiction of Clement VIII, and the Constitutions were reformed in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent. . . . The life of old Syon was lived again . . . in 1628 Father Foster went to his reward. The Brothers died out with the century, but the Sisters lived on. On the morning of September 8th, 1760, Joseph Barette paid them a visit. There were about twenty Sisters then: "Nuns of all countries are soft and obliging speakers; but these are certainly the softest and most obliging that ever fell in my way . . . They are liberal to everybody of chocolates, cakes and sweetmeats . . . their reputation was never sullied in the least since their establishment . . . But let me tell you a story of Lady Hill (the present Abbess of the English Nunnery), which really deserves to be saved from oblivion. . . . Soon after having made profession (1728) a good estate in Ireland was vacated by a relation that died intestate. To get the estate without going to Ireland herself was thought difficult and subject to much delay . . . the Patriarch, upon a simple promise of return, gave her leave to secularize her dress and depart. She did so; arrived in Ireland; produced her title, took possession, and found herself at once in a condition to live in ease and even in splendour in her native country . . . she was not yet three and twenty, and handsome

Syon Abbey

enough. However, if she was tempted she was tempted in vain, for she sold the estate as speedily as she could, and, faithful to her vow and promise, hastened back to the Nunnery with the money . . . This was done by a woman ! This superiority to worldly pleasure, and this fidelity to an onerous engagement was found in a female breast ! Would any friar in similar circumstances have behaved so nobly, and have returned to his less heavy fetters after so lucky an escape ? This question I will not answer for the honour of my own sex.* Baretti goes on to state that the nuns immediately chose the lady as Superior. This is incorrect. Her first term of office did not begin until 1747.

The centuries passed and the tide of the Reformation reached those countries which had remained Catholic in the Sixteenth. There was the French Revolution and then Bonaparte, and Bonaparte was in Spain ; every day had its rumour, and every rumour brought the coming of the dread conqueror nearer and nearer. The Abbess took fright and with some of the nuns returned to England. They took nearly all the pre-Reformation treasures with them. The nuns died one by one, the treasures were scattered, some found their way to museums, some were lost. Meanwhile the remnant at Lisbon still held on. The English fleet were there. The " Jacks " went ashore. " Feeling good," they visited the churches—and the church of the English nuns, of course. If the boys had no religion, they had no prejudices. There was Exposition everywhere ; they studied the altars carefully. What was that metal star, and why was the one in the Sisters' church so poor and plain ? . . . " By Jove, they shall have as fine a house for their God as the Portuguese "; and they made a collection and sent it to the convent. The nuns bought a new monstrance and they use it still.

In 1809 Lord Wellesley turned the Sisters out of house and home, and the convent became a barracks. Things went from bad to worse. The religious houses around

* *A Journey from London to Genoa*, Joseph Baretti. 4 vols. London, 1770. Vol. I, p. 191 seq.

Syon Abbey

them fell one by one; Syon stood erect under the shadow of the Union Jack, but anything might happen any day, and in England there was the promise of the Second Spring; they would go. On August 27th, 1861, Mass was said and the doors were opened and the nuns passed out. Crowds lined their passage to the quay, where the royal barge awaited them to take them to the steamer.

Their first resting-place was at Spettisbury; in 1887 they went to Chudleigh, in Devonshire. There they still pray for the Hero of Agincourt and the Archbishop of 500 years ago, and the Divine praises still encircle the altar throne of the King of kings and Lord of lords. The world has changed in 500 years, but He, "He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

J. L. COMOX.

THE CENTENARY OF JOHN LINGARD'S HIS- TORY

A LITTLE more than a century ago, during one of the most turbulent periods in English Catholic history, was published Dr. John Lingard's *History of England*, the first volumes of which appeared on May 3rd, 1819.

Persecution, it is true, had passed away with the Acts of 1778 and 1791, but, relieved of the cruellest of its disabilities, in its struggle for further relief, the seemingly moribund Church had discovered an energy which, dividing it into factions, retarded progress and seriously threatened its future. The division first showed itself in the negotiations for the Act of 1778. These were conducted by a committee of Catholic laity from which the bishops were carefully excluded. To Bishop Hay, indeed, the remark was made that the less the bishops were seen in the matter the better, and he was refused admittance to their meeting. The Act once passed, the Catholic gentry, encouraged to further efforts, set up a permanent Catholic Committee to conduct their business. The Committee soon fell foul of the bishops, and during the negotiations for the second Bill of 1791, by persistently supporting a proposed oath of allegiance that the bishops had condemned, brought the country to the verge of schism. The Committee were defeated, mainly through the exertions of John Milner, then priest at Winchester, afterwards, as Bishop and Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District, the most prominent figure in twenty years of furious controversy. The bishops had been united in 1791, but in the years that followed they were, unhappily, divided. The new struggle centred chiefly on the famous Veto question. It was suggested that, in return for Emancipation, the English Government should be allowed a qualified veto on the appointment of the Catholic

The Centenary of

bishops. The question soon became a source of bitter dissension, and, as has been said, the bishops themselves were not united. Milner, for a short period an advocate of the Veto, soon became its strongest English opponent, the most vigorous writer in the years of searing controversy that ensued. How bitter that controversy was; how harsh, even scurrilous, were the speeches, pamphlets, and even pastorals that dealt with the subject can be realized by reading them. Time after time measures were suggested or promoted by the one party, only to be withdrawn or defeated, failures wrecked by the action of their opponents. Nor was the discord confined to this one political question, for on almost every common problem of policy the bishops were at odds. It was with this turmoil at its worst, and all the energy of his contemporaries going to heap yet higher the fuel of hot domestic strife, that John Lingard set himself to re-write English History.

To write such a work at such a time was, indeed, a remarkable achievement, the more remarkable since its author was no mere bookworm, no Goethe to study Chinese geography while his country agonized. Lingard, at this time close on fifty years of age, was a very shrewd and capable man of affairs, to whom bishops habitually went for counsel, who had been entrusted with the execution of several very delicate commissions, and had already refused a mitre. Twice, later, was the offer repeated, and once, it seems certain, he all but received the Cardinal's scarlet. He was born at Winchester, February 5th, 1771, in the last years of the old penal code. Catholicism in England was at its darkest hour. The tiny remnant of the Ancient Church numbered scarcely 60,000, and for years past a steady decline had set in. The year of his birth is also of interest since it witnessed, at the Old Bailey, the last trial of a priest for the exercise of his priestly office—Bishop James Talbot, coadjutor to the venerable Bishop Challoner.

1780 is famous for the Gordon Riots, and it was with the remembrance of this well before him, in the uncertain

John Lingard's History

half-lights of the slowly dawning day, that, in 1782, Lingard entered Douai College. Here he remained until the Revolutionary Wars brought about its dissolution in 1793, when, after hairbreadth adventures he succeeded in returning to England. In his eleven years at Douai he had gained for himself a reputation for uncommon ability and a scholarship far above the average, and when Bishop William Gibson, in 1794, founded, at Crook Hall in Durham, a college to take the place of Douai, Lingard went thither as vice-president. In April, 1795, he was ordained priest at York, and for the following sixteen years remained at Crook Hall, and on the removal of the college in 1808, at Ushaw, teaching in turn philosophy and theology. The death of the president—Mr. Eyre—in 1810 gave him his opportunity of escaping from the uncongenial routine of college life, and on the appointment of a new president, in 1811, he retired to the tiny mission of Hornby, nine miles from Lancaster. In this quiet Lancashire village he spent the forty years of life that remained to him, years given over almost entirely to literature and history.

When the idea of writing a History of England first came to Lingard, what first suggested it to him, no one seems to know. History was a favourite study since childhood, when, as she herself tells us, his mother "was accustomed to hire books, particularly historical ones," for his reading. In after years, at Crook Hall, for the entertainment of the community in the long winter evenings, he wrote a series of papers dealing with Anglo-Saxon antiquities. These papers, read to the circle round the single fireside at Crook, his hearers prevailed on him to publish, and they appeared at Newcastle in 1806 as *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. "From this time on," says Tierney, "his friends never ceased to urge him to a continuance of the work, and to the publication of a general history of the country." Charles Butler, Bishop Milner's *bête noire* but always Lingard's staunch friend, pressed him to write on the Anglo-Norman Church, but anxiety lest, in the then divided state of Catholics,

The Centenary of

such a work might injure the college in which he was teaching, delayed his assent, and for the moment the idea was set aside. At Hornby he was more free, and "the solicitations of his friends came to assist the inclination of his genius, and after some time it was generally understood that he was employed on this important work." At first this was nothing more ambitious than a manual for schools. Writing, in August, 1813, to a friend, he says: "I have proceeded but a short way in my abridgement of English History for the use of schools . . . As to the Anglo-Norman Church I must leave that to some future period." But his method of work, and the rule he set himself at the commencement of his task, "to admit no statement merely on trust, to weigh with care the value of the authorities on which I rely," led him to researches far deeper than could find expression in a mere textbook for schools, and it was for a much more ambitious work that, in 1818, he sought a publisher. Two Catholics whom he approached declined, as at first did Mawman, a Protestant, to whom he then went, but who, after a conversation with Lord Holland, reconsidered the matter and finally accepted, paying for the first three volumes—i.e., to the death of Henry VII—a thousand guineas. These three volumes appeared, as has been said, in 1819. The following year saw the publication of the fourth, and the rest followed at intervals, until, in 1830, the concluding volume brought the history down to the Revolution of 1688.

The three volumes sold well and a second edition was soon called for. As the work grew and times and personages of more general interest than Anglo-Saxon kings and queens were treated of, notices and critiques began to appear in the various reviews. It was the hey-day of the reviewer, when the praise or condemnation these anonymous literary pontiffs dealt out had a wonderful influence on the fortunes of a book and the reputation of its writer. Of these magazines the Whig quarterly, the *Edinburgh Review*, was perhaps the most celebrated, and it devoted three articles to Lingard's work. The first of them was

John Lingard's History

written by Dr. Allen—librarian to the Maecenas of the day, the Lord Holland that was Macaulay's patron—and appeared in the April number for 1825. He began by giving Lingard high praise for his learning, scholarship, and fidelity to truth. "Dr. Lingard is already known to the world by several valuable publications. His *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* displays much research and erudition. . . . His present work will not detract from the reputation he has acquired, and, indeed, the success it has already acquired is a proof at once of its merits and of the good taste and judgment of the public. It has deservedly placed him amongst the most eminent of our English historians." Then, after a complimentary paragraph on the literary qualities of the work, "He possesses what he claims, the rare merit of having collected his materials from original historians and records. He has not copied at second-hand from other compilers; nor, like many of his brethren, retailed to us the vapid dregs of repeated transfusions from the primary sources of information. To borrow his own metaphor, he has not drawn from the troubled stream, but drunk from the fountain-head. His narrative has accordingly a freshness and originality not to be found in any general history in common use. . . . The diligent perusal and study of our ancient historians, the critical examination of their works, the careful and judicious comparison of their statements where they differ, have enabled Dr. Lingard to explain many transactions that were before obscure, to show the connection between events that appeared before disjointed, and to make many salient corrections in our history . . . There is no general history we would sooner recommend."

In the multitudes of authorities to which it appeals, and in the exactness of its references, he declares "it will bear comparison with the productions of Robertson or of Gibbon." The author is credited with "diligence, learning, and critical acuteness" and his work "is the fruit of great industry, learning, and acuteness, directed by no ordinary talent."

The Centenary of

But Lingard was a priest, and as such frankly suspect. Where his narrative is concerned with ecclesiastical affairs ordinary methods of criticism are laid by, the reviewer goes by the way of imputation and suggestion, and the eulogy with which he had commended Lingard as a guide is for the moment qualified. The remainder of the article is taken up with a critique of insignificant details to illustrate what the reviewer had "observed with sorrow," that "in his eagerness to establish a favourite theory, he [Lingard] overlooks every troublesome or adverse authority, distorts facts to form a foundation for his system, and borrows from his own fancy whatever is wanting for its support and embellishment." All this "grave turning over of antique rubbish as to the purity or profligacy of Edwy and Ethelgiva" (the subject of Allen's chief attack) was to be the test of "the degree of confidence that may be safely placed in Dr. Lingard."

Yet in spite of the prejudice against things Catholic that possessed Allen, he could not but admit the value of Lingard's account of the Reformation. "The fabric he has reared against the Reformation is reared by no vulgar hand . . . If any stimulus besides the duty of vindicating the founders of their Church were wanting, we might venture to assure them [the Anglican clergy] that, in an age when religious controversy is so liberally rewarded as the present, the stone which smites this colossus and breaks it to pieces cannot fail to become a great mountain and overshadow all its fellows." In conclusion a second article was promised, for the *History* was "a work of too much importance, and calculated to influence public opinion to too great an extent, to admit of its being left without further notice."

But before the promised continuation appeared some anonymous defender of Lingard wrote a strongly worded protest against the treatment meted out to his *History* in the *Edinburgh*. This indignant and scornful letter aroused Lord Holland's cantankerous librarian to great heights of fury. He made sure Lingard was its author, and in the June following (1826) his wrath took

John Lingard's History

shape in a bitter attack on the account of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Now, important as this event is, it is not English history, and only comes into Lingard's work incidentally. Indeed, what Allen attacked was a note on the Massacre in the appendix. But fancying he had, on this point, a good case against the historian's good faith and honesty, he chose it as the ground of a most savagely inconsistent attack. He led off by the remark that "We were prepared for many errors and misrepresentations in this part of his work, and certainly we have not been mistaken in our expectations. The harvest has been infinitely more abundant than we had expected, and our opinion of Dr. Lingard as an historian has, in the same proportion, declined." Then Lingard's statements, and the evidence he quotes in their support, are taken in detail and subjected to microscopic examination. "No marks of diligence are to be found," while the narration is disfigured by "many plain indications of carelessness and haste, of borrowed learning, and inexcusable indifference to historical accuracy." Then the historian is lectured in the classic reviewer's best style. "If he had read with attention, . . . If he had taken the pains to examine the authorities he cites, . . . If he had even perused with ordinary care . . ." with much more in the same vein, while to conclude there is Allen's own account of the St. Bartholomew, contradictory to Lingard's, and a multitudinous array of testimonies to prove it. The effect of this second article is, on a mere reading, overpowering, and it seems proof conclusive of Allen's contentions, justification for the warning with which his article ends: "To ordinary readers, unacquainted with the history of their country, who believe what they read because they find it written, it is a work of the most dangerous description, which will impress their minds with false and incorrect notions of the history of their country, and of the character and conduct of their ancestors. Let them recollect that there is no fact to be credited without examination, no impression to be received without doubt, on the mere authority of Dr. Lingard."

The Centenary of

Lingard himself was for the moment dazed by the violence and apparent learning of his critic. The array of witnesses Allen cited filled him—on his own confession—with dismay, but when, at the end of the article, “I saw him, toiling and writhing under the attempt to reconcile his theory with an indisputed fact,” dismay lessened, “and when I had compared my own statements with the critique, it existed no longer.” He immediately set to work to answer his opponent, and carefully going over the whole ground anew, verifying his authorities and investigating Allen’s, produced the *Vindication of certain passages in the Fourth and Fifth Volumes of the History of England*—a pamphlet almost as celebrated in its day as the opening chapters of the *Apologia* forty years later; it speedily ran through five editions.

It was the appearance of the *Vindication* that gave the *Westminster Review* an opportunity of noticing Lingard’s book. The *Westminster* reviewer writes with greater calmness and in a more judicial spirit than Allen, and with more knowledge of the book he criticizes. “We carefully read all the volumes of his *History* as they were successively published, and in pursuing several historical investigations, have collated and compared them with the works of his predecessors and contemporaries. We can, therefore, honestly affirm that our opinion is the result of deliberate examination—not the hasty criticism of casual references or hurried perusal.” The author of the *Edinburgh* article is severely dealt with. “Instead of a general investigation of the historical merits of Dr. Lingard, we are presented with a minute and elaborate investigation of the circumstances attending the Massacre of St. Bartholomew . . . it is by no means fair to try the author of a long and laborious history of England by a note of an event out of the main line of his researches. . . . The reviewer has pounced upon what he conceived to be a vulnerable part with absolute ravidness . . . When a charitable critic might at least have hinted at the possibility of a mistake or misconception he has loudly proclaimed misrepresentation, dishonesty, and all manner

John Lingard's History

of historical delinquency." Finally, "The tone of the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* clearly indicates the pampered oracle of a coterie, who is deeply offended that anyone should presume to write history without a diploma from himself or his admirers." The *Edinburgh*, fixing on two points as typical instances, had sought to ruin Lingard's character for fairness: "The result of our scrutiny," declared Allen in his second article, "was unfavourable to his reputation as a candid and faithful historian." The *Westminster*, declining to enter into the historical controversy, set out to defend the historian's honesty and good faith. It praises the tone of the "*Vindication*, a model of controversial style: the scholar, the gentleman, the divine, appear in their best character." It has "calm dignity" and "spirited firmness" which are "strong assurances of the rectitude of his intentions, and of the truth of his cause." The *Westminster* reviewer is chiefly concerned with the controversy and only indirectly is his article a critique of the *History*. "A history of England by a Roman Catholic priest," he notes, "was assuredly destined to be met with coldness and suspicion. It required merit of a very high order to contend successfully against the prejudices of a nation of Protestants, glorying in the reformation of their ancient creed, and still eyeing with jealousy the adherents of the once predominant faith. . . ." "We acknowledge that on the announcement of a history of England by a priest of the Roman Catholic faith we did apprehend that neither the spirit of his religion nor the habits of his profession were calculated to prepare him for the composition of an impartial work," but "Catholic priests are not necessarily either bad citizens or bad historians," and "it is true, and his enemies admit it, that Dr. Lingard must take his station amongst the most distinguished of the writers who have investigated the annals of this country."

Lingard's reply to Allen more than cleared his work, and when, on the completion of his book, a third article appeared in the *Edinburgh*, a change of tone was manifested

The Centenary of

from the first. Its writer was himself an historian of repute—Henry Hallam; and though not free from anti-Catholic prejudice, the review is distinctly favourable to Lingard. Like Allen, he regrets the absence of dissertations on the "Philosophy of History," the solemn (not to say long-winded) judgments with which the classic historians, Hume and Gibbon, had so plentifully interlarded their narrative. Yet "the merits of Dr. Lingard are of a high class. He generally discusses controverted facts with candour (except on one subject), acuteness and perspicuity. He selects, in general, judiciously, arranges naturally, relates without prolixity or confusion." His praise of the account of the Reformation is, especially if the times are recalled in which it was written, exceedingly valuable. "No angry expression, no arrogance or indignation, betrays the writer's intention: a placid neutrality and an almost affected indifference to the whole subject seems to guide his pen." The facts are related with "consummate dexterity," "with simplicity and fairness." "He exhibited the fathers of the Anglican Reformation and all the circumstances of that great revolution in the laws and opinions of England . . . unfavourably, and yet to all appearance . . . dispassionately, and with . . . a perpetual appeal to authority." Again, Hallam "is glad to be able to bestow upon [Dr. Lingard] the high and not very usual commendation, of having corrected in a great degree that propensity to carry party spirit into the narration of past times, from which writers of his profession are seldom exempt."

Ten years earlier Lingard had written to Dr. Kirk: "Throughout the work I made it a rule to tell the truth, whether it made for us or against us; to avoid all appearance of controversy, that I might not repel Protestant readers, and yet to furnish every necessary proof in our favour in the notes." How well he had succeeded was told in every line of Hallam's article, and its praise, coming after so much unintelligent criticism from old-fashioned Catholics, must have been singularly encouraging to the historian.

John Lingard's History

But the review was mainly concerned with Lingard's last three volumes, the fight between King and "Parliament" in the Seventeenth Century. On this subject no *Edinburgh* reviewer could have been without strong predilections, nay prejudices, and Hallam's commendation of the "rigorous impartiality that Lingard uniformly displays on political questions" is little short of marvellous, and goes far to lessen his adverse criticism of particular points. "The reign of James II might be deemed the test of a Roman Catholic historian," he proceeds. "Dr. Lingard has passed very successfully through the ordeal. His imperturbable serenity never deserts him, the arbitrary conduct and infatuated policy of the king are surrendered without extenuation; and though he is evidently unwilling to assign any better motive than ambition to the enterprise of William, he abstains from anything like invective." No Catholic could, with truth, have said as much for the *Edinburgh* history, least of all for its chief exponent, Macaulay. Finally, we must mention the high praise Hallam gives to Lingard's style. Indeed, he quotes whole pages to show its many beauties—the account of Cromwell's violent dissolution of the Rump in 1653, of the sea-fight with the Dutch in 1665, and of the Great Plague of that same year. Of the last he goes so far as to say it "may even fairly challenge comparison with the well-known account of the plague at Athens by Thucydides."

In striking contrast to this scholarly critique was the notice in *Blackwood's Magazine*. None of the four reviews we have quoted were written by men who viewed history from Lingard's standpoint; none of them were predisposed in his favour; the *Blackwood's* article was the production of a mind steeped in anti-Catholic prejudice. It is entitled "Dr. Lingard." "This Roman Catholic divine," we are told, "has been for years producing what he calls a *History of England*. He is a thorough Papist, and, of course, his work is in the thorough spirit of his blinded and unhappy faith, venomous with the most sanctified appearance of impartiality, ignorant

The Centenary of

with the most pompous display of authorities, and hostile to all the national feelings of religious liberality, with the most specious professions of attachment and freedom of principle . . . As the Roman Catholics have throughout all this contest [the struggle for Emancipation] exhibited the most striking dearth of literature, a dearth to be accounted for only by the paralysing effect of a belief which enslaves the human understanding, they have, of course, magnified the miracle of a *History* appearing among them, and Dr. Lingard is now the elected champion of the Popish Church against fact, feeling, and the faith of the English. The *Edinburgh Review* has, in the habitual spirit of that mischievous and malignant agent, adopted this disciple of Jesuitry and lauded his work as it lauded Bonaparte, and as it lauds everything that common sense and national honour would stigmatize and scorn. Dr. Lingard is a man of some ability and some reading, not comparable for a moment to any of the leading names amongst the historians of England or her Church, yet a wonder in the general ignorance and dullness of the Popish writers of his time . . ." So the tirade goes on for a couple of pages, until, forgetting Lingard and his book, it falls into the evidently familiar invective against the Whigs and Emancipation, with tilts at O'Connell and the Jesuits by the way. Of such sort was literary Toryism in 1826.

By his fellow-Catholics Lingard's work was received with the greatest interest and with almost universal approval. Translations were speedily prepared into French and German, and by the Pope's command an Italian version was printed at the press of Propaganda. In Rome, from its first appearance, it had been received with a delight bordering on enthusiasm. "Your fourth volume," the Rector of the English College wrote to the author, "arrived here about three weeks ago, to the joy of the whole house. . . . As soon as we have finished it once over it is bespoken at the Scotch College; then by Fr. O'Finan of the Irish Dominicans; then by Mgr. Testa, the Pope's Latin secretary . . . Their eagerness

John Lingard's History

is extreme. We have heard it with the highest satisfaction. . . . You must have a D.D. prefixed to your name in the title-page of the next." Five years later, Gradwell again writes from Rome : " Your *History* is much spoken of here as one of the great causes that have wrought such a change in public sentiment in England on Catholic matters."

But there was one small section of Catholic opinion that dissented from this chorus of approval and praise. Bishop Milner, staunch and uncompromising opponent of the Veto, " champion of God's ark in an evil time," considering that Lingard " had sold his principles with his manuscript," wrote furiously in the *Orthodox Journal* against the book. A bitter controversy followed, which only ended when the Holy See forbade Milner from writing further for the magazine. His objections were chiefly concerned with Lingard's method. The *History* was not sufficiently polemical for his taste. Its tone was too impartial, the writer too much the judge and too little the advocate, and such an attitude, where controverted facts were in question, tended, so Milner thought, gravely to compromise the cause of the Church. Read to-day, his criticisms sound narrow and unreasonable, but it must be remembered they were written by the leader of a generation that had all but passed away, bred for times that had, in fact, disappeared. Milner was the last great figure of a great time ; Lingard, the herald of a new age, the harbinger of a second spring. His work struck a new note in English Catholic literature ; it was the firstfruit of a new scholarship that differed in its whole outlook and form from the scholarship that was Milner's ideal. Hence to be fair to Milner's memory we must, when recalling his onslaught on Lingard's *History*, recall, too, the mighty literature he himself summed up, and the time that had produced it.

That the papists of the Seventeenth, and especially of the Eighteenth, Centuries had a literature may sound incredible to those who know only their poverty and lack of resources, the oppression under which they laboured,

The Centenary of

and their scanty leisure for study. Yet a literature they had, a literature—it is no exaggeration to say it—of masterpieces. Douai was its fountain-head, no petty seminary, but a college that had for its first lecturers and scholars the flower of the English universities. Allen himself, Bristowe, Martin, and Stapleton were the pioneers of this persecuted literature, and the exemplar of the work they were inaugurating, their earliest fruit, was the *Doway Bible*. Nor were there wanting in every succeeding generation capable minds to carry on the high tradition.

All this literature is characterized by profound learning, and by scholarship as deep as it is unassuming, and every line is stamped with that gravity and restraint that so soon became the very atmosphere of English Catholic life, the uniform habit of its piety. Its literary style varied, naturally: much of it had a foreign cast that betrayed the writer educated in exile; but like most contemporary prose it ever bore itself with dignity, self-conscious at times, perhaps, but never declining to mere grandiloquence. Two, at least, of the writers—Allen and Gother—achieved a prose of classic strength and beauty that had they written in other times, or of other matter, would have won them fame as writers. But however the manner varied, the matter was sure to be pretty much the same. Two ends conditioned all they wrote: the encouragement and spiritual advancement of the flock committed to them and the ever-present struggle with the heretic. As time went on the controversy tended more and more to become a mere refutation of current calumny and misrepresentation, and from constantly writing in defence of himself the Catholic scholar gradually acquired, as a habit, the apologetic and explanatory manner of address. This note runs all through the penal literature and needs no great tracing even in works not primarily controversial. Did a Catholic write History? If for his co-religionists it was in part a refutation of heresy; if he wrote for a general public, he was at great pains continually to point the moral and to

John Lingard's History

draw the obvious lesson of the misfortune that heresy and schism bring to nations and individuals alike. Fewer and fewer books were written that would command a general hearing, and writers confined themselves to the task of fortifying the scattered faithful against the inevitable dangers that came from isolation in an heretical land. Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, written in the last years of the Eighteenth Century, is a specimen of this latest penal literature at its best. An earlier work had provoked the anti-Catholic zeal of a dignitary of the Establishment, and in answer to him Milner reviewed the history of the Church of England from its foundation. From its first opening words the book is a masterpiece of controversy. Its ruthless exposition of facts and unsparing sarcasm of tone, the way in which his adversary is driven from point to point and left without any loophole of escape, make abundantly clear the root of his criticism of Lingard. For Lingard's work strikes a new note. He came "to pursue a different course from that of his predecessors." *They* had appeared as advocates—*he* was an unimpassioned narrator; *they* had avowedly argued for victory—*he* simply stated the case that was before him; *they* had drawn their own conclusions and exhibited their own views—*he* allowed the narrative to tell its own tale, to make its own impression, and to suggest the inferences that would naturally arise from it. The old scholarship, the profound learning that comes from long and painstaking research is there, the old high-minded courage, essential to the papist who would write, but the method and tone of the book are something altogether new. He intended his book for the great public outside the Church, where history was such a phantasy. "The good to be done," he himself stated, "is by writing a book which Protestants will read"; and, again, "My only chance of being read by Protestants depends on my having the reputation of a temperate writer." If only Protestants would read the *History*, he trusted the bare facts, set down simply and without comment, to tell their own tale and point their own moral. It was in this sense that he

John Lingard's History

wrote to Dr. Gradwell in 1819, just a month after the first volumes had appeared: "My object has been to write such a work, if possible, as should be read by Protestants, under the idea that the more it is read by them the less Hume will be in vogue, and, consequently, the fewer prejudices against us will be imbibed from him." How completely he succeeded the reviews go to show: the praise of his impartiality from the most scholarly and the fierce denunciation of the extremists in both parties.

Almost a century has passed since these controversies, and their fires have long since burned out, their ashes, even, scattered to the winds. Lingard still lives and his work is still of high repute. Since he wrote, the labours of a century's research have placed at the disposal of historical writers documentary evidence infinitely greater in extent than was obtainable then. Yet in all this array of testimony nothing has been discovered to discredit the writer of a hundred years ago. Lord Acton, the most widely read, surely, of modern historians, could declare that "Lingard has never been found wrong," and college tutors can still recommend his book as "the best general history of England." It would hardly be an exaggeration, indeed, to claim that what fifty years ago Cardinal Wiseman prophesied has come to pass: "When Hume shall have fairly taken his place amongst the classical writers of our tongue, and Macaulay shall have been transferred to the shelves of romancers and poets, and each shall thus have received his true meed of praise, then Lingard will be still more conspicuous as the only impartial historian of our country."

PHILIP HUGHES.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

NOT many Kings of England have been mentioned for canonization: Alfred, Edward the Confessor, Henry the Sixth, James the Second. Change of dynasty and the Reformation prevented the cause of Henry being consummated. His exceedingly rare *Memoir*, by the Carthusian John Blacman, has been reprinted from the copy at Ushaw and edited by Dr. James, who has been Provost of both of Henry's Foundations (Cambridge University Press). The tract was due to Henry VII's action in referring the sanctity of his predecessor to the Second Julius. By his position Dr. James would be the proper person to advance the canonization to-day. Other reasons add to an ideal editorship. We learn little points of history which we would fain see scribbled into the margins of our textbooks. We know the sins of so many English kings that it is pleasant to know that, according to the Bishop of Salisbury, his confessor, King Henry was without mortal sin during their ten years of intercourse. The memoir was in Latin, preserving twice the English words of the King. When they set dancing girls before him he fled, crying, "Fy, fy, for shame, forsothe ye be to blame." He hated swearing, and his King's oath sounds plaintive beside Henry the Eighth's. When wounded in the Tower he patiently exclaimed, "Forsothe and forsothe, ye do fouly to smite a king anointed so." We learn that he was shocked by bathers at Bath, that riding in by Cripplegate he ordered a traitor's quarter to receive Christian burial, that he wore round-toed boots like a farmer, and a hair-shirt when he wore his Crown, that he pardoned rebels and enemies, and even from the Tower of London prevented a woman drowning a child. But he was duly rewarded by visions, and he heard the voices of Mary and Dunstan and Anselm. The Army Service Corps would be interested and edified to know that he multiplied the soldiers' rations by prayer.

He was aware of the Real Presence and passed a pyx without reverence, knowing that the Host was not there.

Some Recent Books

Imprisoned in the Tower, he was content to lose his kingdom, saying, "Our kinsman of March thrusts himself into it as is his pleasure. This one thing only do I require, to receive the Sacrament at Easter and the rites of the Church on Maundy Thursday." Three times he had seen the Glory and Crown of Our Lord in vision upon the feast of St. Edward. Good was his saying that he preferred priests "somewhat weak in music than defective in knowledge of the scriptures." There is a little humour in his custom of sending letters to clerics "full of heavenly mysteries and most salutary advice, to the great wonder of many!" His passion was followed by violent death, and he was buried at Chertsey, but Richard found it necessary to remove his body to Windsor because his miracles were causing a reaction in favour of the House of Lancaster.

S. L.

ONE wonders whether Dr. Bosanquet has been reading Luther. Certainly he makes Justification by Faith the cardinal doctrine of religion, even as Luther did. He does more in *What Religion Is* (Macmillan). Like Luther, he makes religion a matter of experience, and like Luther he interprets it as trust. "We are saved by giving ourselves to something which we cannot help holding supreme." "The root of our certainty is very thoroughly present, if not before our minds as a doctrine, then at least in them as an attitude." The nature of this trust is never explained, nor the nature of that in which we trust. "Be a whole or join a whole. You cannot be a whole unless you join a whole. This, I believe, is religion." "When we get away from this simple basis of religion, we are very apt to go further and fare worse."

The doctrine is Luther's, though stated in Hegelian terms, and from it Dr. Bosanquet deduces two eminently Lutheran corollaries. Of religious truth "every man in the end must judge for himself." Of course he must, if religion be religiosity, and he know not what he worships, nor has received a revelation. The second corollary concerns sin. Says the mystic: "The devil may keep my

What Religion is

sins, and the world my flesh ; I live in God's will, his life shall be my life, his will my will ; I will be dead in my reason that he may live in me, and all my deeds shall be his deeds." Dr. Bosanquet approves. Religion, he says, does not abolish man's finiteness—his weakness and his sin. "What it does is to make him deny that they are real." "*Bona fides* is the ultimate need in all matters of conduct." If you have that, then, though besides "the object of faith, you will, also, things that *as you will them* . . . are its enemy," it does not matter. You can always say, "This which I am, is not really I. I am *bona fides* other, and this self, though I am it, I reject and disown."

The consequences of such a doctrine the history of Lutheranism amply illustrates. They have recently been admitted at Oxford by no less an authority than Professor Amundsen, of Copenhagen. Dr. Bosanquet doubtless does not mean that, granted faith, sin can be ignored, yet his words imply this, even as did Luther's.

Apart from the Hegelian setting, in one point only does Dr. Bosanquet differ from Luther. He despises doctrine as speculation, and again and again warns us against it. "We are to remain in the great experience, and take it simply, and not to allow subtle reasonings and clamours for explanation to distort our vision of it." But ought one not to seek to know God, as well as to trust and to love Him ? Nay, does not the intensity of one's trust and love depend very largely upon the extent of one's knowledge ? It seems to me that one of the greatest values of belief in God is that it enters into and enables us to harmonize our experience, and that where faith is weak or evanescent, it is so, precisely because God is not known, and hence does not appear to harmonize experience or to solve its problems.

Delightful and even inspiring as is Dr. Bosanquet's little work in many respects, we cannot but think that he errs in making religion so blind, so irrational, so mysterious. "It is a false idea," says Hegel, "that these two, faith and free philosophical investigation, can subsist

Some Recent Books

quietly side by side, in isolation one from the other." In following Luther, Dr. Bosanquet has forsaken Hegel and has returned to the position of Hegel's opponents, the *Illuminati*.
L. J. W.

THE first sign of decency of feeling between English and German appears in a *Berlin Diary* (Constable) written by a German Princess, who, though an English Catholic, christened the German battle-cruiser "Blücher," which her relations, including her brother-in-law, afterwards sunk by gunfire in the North Sea! A granddaughter of Lord Petre, she married the great-grandson of Marshal Blücher. Her father-in-law was "famous for rearing kangaroos" on an island he leased from the British Government until the French insisted on his removal.

During the war she lived the life of a German Princess, scarcely disguising her sympathies for England and causing trouble by her "dangerous talk." After the peace, like a true woman she began to pity Germany, and offers a very fair presentment of the German case to her victorious countrymen. There can be no doubt that no German woman in England would have been allowed to minister to prisoners of her own folk, as she did day and night, searching for names and records, distributing comforts and messages in the prison camps. She gives a presentment of the Kaiser from the beginning which will cause certain pressmen to revise their view concerning "the Beast of Berlin." His family relationships with England put him in as ridiculous a position as herself. She records his words in 1914: "To think that Nicholas and Georgie should have played me false!"—a situation which is enough to condemn the whole King-system. Another entry reads: "Prince Hohenlohe is leaving for the front. He is a cousin to King George, and looks and is English in every way." The curious thing is that Germans believed as much in atrocities committed on their troops as the Allies did with regard to theirs. When her English cousin was missing, she went to the War Office and noted,

A Berlin Diary

"Everyone is kind and sympathetic in helping us to trace him." Either her rank carried very far or the German bureaucracy is different to what is imagined. She fought for the English cause at dining tables, and when she attacked Bethmann's "scrap of paper," a German quoted Lord Salisbury, saying "Agreements were made to be broken," though perhaps, may we suggest, Salisbury was only thinking of agreements with Ireland?

As to killing the English prisoners, the Princess sent an inquiry to Bavarian Headquarters, and the Crown Prince replied: "We want prisoners who can talk and tell us something. There would be no point in killing them." The Austrians, it appears, were too busy criticizing Germany to bother to hate England. The private view of Jagow was not that Grey but Northcliffe was the villain in egging on the war. The murder of Miss Cavell falls upon Sauberzweig, not on Bissing, who pleaded for her acquittal. Princess Blücher felt it was impossible for her to have done what she was accused of doing in a town where, "if one sneezes out of tune, one is accused of signalling to the enemy." The wife of the man who invented poison gas, and helped him in his laboratory, committed suicide when she saw the use made of it, and her husband said he was proud to have sacrificed his wife to the cause! They seem to have been much more polite to English wives than the English were to Germans. Prince Munster used to say, chaffingly, "If you want to see Countess Blücher smile, tell her the Germans are running short of ammunition!" We can echo her comment, "I wish the world would run short of ammunition for ever!"

After the taking of Warsaw she kept a record of the young men who claimed they had been the first to enter. They came to nearly a hundred! England was full at the same time of the heroes who had each been the last man to leave Ostend. She records a very amusing story: "A Catholic soldier refused to go to confession. What is there to confess, he said; stealing is permitted, and killing a duty." A strong commentary on war! There

Some Recent Books

is a very amusing account of Tirpitz, whom the Emperor forced to resign for reasons of "bad health." He immediately walked up and down Wilhelm Strasse for two hours and talked so loudly to his wife that the crowd could overhear his case. In 1916 she recorded a curious piece of Catholic folklore in Silesia :

*" Si Marcus pascham dabit
Et Johannes Christum adorabit
Totus Mundus vae clamabit."*

Which means that when St. Mark falls in Easter week and St. John's Day in the Octave of Whitsuntide the whole world will wail. This befell in 1916. The Catholic party in Germany joined the Pacifist against the Pan-Germans, whose cry, "We want a good peace of our own from God and not a bad international one from the Pope," was echoed in England. S. L.

ACCORDING to Dr. Michael Moloney's *Irish Ethno-Botany* (Gill) the native list of Irish plants affording medical material is considerable. The Irish names are generally translations of the Latin or English, but a great many are peculiarly Irish. The House Leek, which used to be grown on the roof as a charm against fires, has no less than five names in Irish. The Golden Rod, called in Irish the "herb of the Palsy," was used by herbalists against depression. Cowslips were given for insomnia under the name of "Yellow Cow's Milk." The Foxglove (in Irish, "the Fairies' Glove") explains that the English originally was Little Folks' Glove. There was a herb for every disease according to the old medicine men, if you could only find it! The Buttercup, or in Irish, "Blood of the Earth" (*Fuil Talmhan*), was used to cure St. Anthony's fire. Celandine and Violet were used for cancer. That the Irish used violets for cancer is interesting, as a modern discoverer used violets for leprosy.

It is noteworthy how many herbs are dedicated in

Irish Ethno-Botany

Irish to the Blessed Virgin. Goldilocks in Irish is "Mary's Hair." Ladies' Smock is "Mary's Linen." The Cinquefoil is "Mary's Five Fingers." The Great Mullein is "Mary's Candle." Henbit is "Mary's Nettle."

The practice of medicine in Ireland was hereditary. Father handed down his book of Latin and Celtic lore to son, and the tribe set apart a piece of land to support the physician. They kept each other alive. For instance, Bally-shiel in the King's County is so called to-day because it was held by the Shiels in virtue of being hereditary physicians to the Macmahons of Oriel. An Irish doctor of the name of Cassidy or Lee or Hickey or Callaghan or Meara or Shiel may be interested to know that he is following hereditary calling.

The O'Cassidies were physicians to the Maguires of Fermanagh from the year 1320. The O'Hickeys (whose beautiful Irish name means healer) were physicians to the O'Briens of Thomond. The O'Lees (whose name is connected with Leech) were physicians to the O'Flaherties. The O'Callaghans were physicians to the MacCarthy's of Cork. The Callaghans and the Callanans must have been the same, for we recall the proverb used of a desperate case, "Even a Callanan could not cure him!" The O'Nellans and O'Quinns also practised medicine. The O'Mearas were physicians to the Butlers of Ormond, and one of the clan was in the service of Napoleon at St. Helena. The only other family we can add to Dr. Moloney's list is that of the MacDunslevys, who were driven out of Down by John de Courcy, fled to Donegal, and settled at Kilmacrenan as physicians to the O'Donnell.

Dr. Moloney instances members of other families who became distinguished doctors abroad, like Neil O'Clacan of Donegal, who wrote on the Plague in the Seventeenth Century and was appointed to the French King, or Bernard O'Connor, who was physician to John Sobieski, the Polish King. Ireland's wounds, unfortunately, were beyond her physicians.

S. L.

Some Recent Books

HE will be a very daring historian, but not altogether incredible, who takes Mr. Maurice Baring as the type of the Briton who won the war, though by his own showing Mr. Baring (*R.F.C.; H.Q.*, 1914-1918, Bell) is in all things unlike the British soldier who wins wars in the old history books. He belonged to no previously recognized species; he had no experience of soldiering, nor any technical knowledge of any arm of the service, and because, seemingly, it was generally admitted that his weapon should have been propaganda and his battlefield St. Petersburg, he was hurried into the Royal Flying Corps and sent to France in August, 1914. He had been helped into his puttees by his chief, Sir David Henderson, the day before he went. On the journey "there was some discussion as to whether I was a lieutenant or a second-lieutenant. It was settled that I was a lieutenant." Little would he have cared had it been decided in a friendly way that he was a colonel. One rank would have fitted as well as another this delightfully haphazard holder of the King's Commission, this complete Army amateur, who, instead of reading, sub-section by sub-section, the King's Regulations, went canto by canto through the *Paradiso*, and book by book through Wordsworth's *Prelude* during his time in France. Promotion and honours came to him, of course—we say of course, since it is impossible to read through this book without realizing the value of his service, and not only of his service but of his traits, his manners, his ease, his distractions, almost we had said his irresponsibility and his carelessness. Only by such men, unless there be others of iron, could a war be carried on for four years without despair or revolutions. It has been said of him that he has written an entirely immoral book because he has made it an amusing one. His wit civilizes the barbarous environment; he finds his comedy in Armageddon. He writes of nothing quite seriously save when recording the loss of friends such as Basil Blackwood or "Bron" Lucas, and he takes nothing quite seriously save only an occasional sunset. His strength lay in his ability to face the

R.F.C.; H.Q., 1914-1918

difficulties of his work gaily. Taken too seriously they would have crushed him. Here is his account of his first important work as Trenchard's note-maker: "I went with him on August 22nd, 1915, to the Third Army, where we visited No. 8, No. 4, and No. 12 squadrons. But the first notes that I can read were made the day after when we visited the first Wing. I have down in my notebook that the General wants some Oxford marmalade for breakfast, that the road near No. 3 squadron is too dusty, and steps must be taken to remedy this. That the first Wing are not to press at present to send home observers to learn to fly; that Christie wants some more double clips for his elevator control. There is also something not quite legible with reference to R.A.F. wires and Crossley spare axles. The General never referred again, that year at least, to his initial talk with me as to whether I should be of use to him or not, but when on the 24th of August, the day after he said he liked Oxford marmalade, there was Oxford marmalade for tea, he said to me, looking at it: 'I see you have got a memory; I shall use it.'" Among the things he had need to remember were synchronizing gears for machine-guns, bomb-sights, gun-cameras, reflection-sights, fish-tail clips, carburettors, rigging, under-carriages, personnel, felt-washers, induction pipes, promotions, petrol-rations, hangars, allied generals and five hundred and one other mysteries. The spare parts he became acquainted with must have run into thousands and would have meant madness to a more fretful and less buoyant spirit. That these things fall into their place in an extraordinarily interesting book without over weighting is as much a triumph of style over material as Maurice Baring's army career was the triumph of the man over the machine. We leave it to history to fasten on the type that achieved the general victory: for ourselves we welcome this book as the truest revelation yet published of the individual victory, the preservation of a personality through the years when Europe was drilled and flattened out. Mr. Baring is never flat, and we doubt if he was ever drilled. E. M.

Some Recent Books

AMID the sour cordials recommended by world reconstructionists, Hilaire Belloc's *Europe and the Faith* (Constable) runs like a strong red wine. He sees Europe steadily and sees it whole with the remark that "the Catholic sees Europe from within." He gives an example in St. Thomas of Canterbury, who is a stumbling block to popular historians as well as to patriotic Protestants, but "is to a Catholic a sharp revelation of the half-way house between the Empire and modern nationalities." The ground on which and the customs for which he fought were selected by the enemy. The customs are extinct, "but the spirit in which he fought was a determination that the Church should never be controlled by the civil power." He defended the self-determination of the Catholic Church to the point of death. He deliberately placed himself in jeopardy when the wrath of the sovereign spelt death. (The case of the Lord Mayor of Cork enables the modern to understand Thomas of Canterbury. On technical ground chosen by the enemy he resisted to the risk of voluntary and Christian death the military control of his country by another, and the Irish people could effect that popular canonization which the English people in holier days obtained for "Thomas of London.")

To be a logical European or historian it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. As a result "he can converse with the First Century or the Fifteenth. Shrines are not odd to him, nor oracles, and if he is the supplanter he is also the heir of the Gods." He ridicules textbooks of English mediæval history without mention of the Blessed Sacrament, "which is as though a man were to write of England in the Nineteenth Century without daring to speak of newspapers." Belloc does not write history proper, it must be admitted. He shows neither the patience of the microscope or the sweep of the telescope, but he makes most attractive shots through opera-glasses and gleans the clearest and quickest-seen pictures possible. Cæsar's conquest of Gaul was the "capital experiment which has determined all future history."

Europe and the Faith

Then as to what was the early Church, this is thrown to the heretic: "Tertullian was as near the Crucifixion as my generation is to the Reform Bill, and he gave us a full description of the Mass." Arianism came from an Imperial Court and became "a swagger," like Bonapartism in France to-day. It is good to realize that "the Dark Ages are a comfort to the modern man, for he sees by their example that the process of increasing complexity reaches its term; that the strain of development is at last relieved, that humanity sooner or later returns upon itself; that there is an end in repose and that the repose is fruitful." Gregory VII incarnated the Middle Ages, yet "he made nothing new. What he did was to stiffen the ideal with reality." The Crusades were the stupendous aftermath of his death. The Middle Ages flowered into St. Thomas Aquin, "the strongest, the most virile intellect which European blood has given to the world." The Black Death upset the mediæval experiment, but Belloc believes "that wills other than those of mortals were in combat for the soul of Europe, as they are in combat daily for the souls of individual men." Came "the disaster commonly called the Reformation," which could only be said to have reformed Europe against itself. It came at a moment like the present, when the world was beginning to move, quickened by doom; and the Holy Church, which "would have rendered the heresies ridiculous, canalized the exaltations, humanized the discoveries," was set aside. Although "no one in the Reformation dreamt a divided Christendom to be possible, Europe rushed upon the road that led to thirty years of war, modern revolution and science, Napoleonism, Prussianism, and Bolshevism. Europe rushed, but the Catholic Church stayed still. The wave picked up a man, just as the modern wave has toyed with three men on its shifting crest, Wilson, Lloyd George, and Lenin. To each of the three Belloc's account of Luther would apply, as "one of those exuberant, rather inconsequential characters which can never pretend to organization or command, though certainly to creative power. What he precisely

Some Recent Books

meant or would do, no man could tell, least of all himself. He was out for protest and he floated on the crest of the general wave of change." The Reformation was sealed by the defect of Britain, the only Roman province to fail that Church into which Providence had transubstantiated the Roman Empire.

And the grand conclusion is that "Europe will return to the Faith or she will perish. The Faith is Europe. And Europe is the Faith." Pantheists and Pan-Anglicans, note. S. L.

THE late Mgr. Sigourney Fay appears by name in the dedication and by pseudonym in the text of *This Side of Paradise*, Mr. Scott Fitzgerald's successful sensation on the American market. Mgr. D'Arcy, like Disraeli's Mgr. Catesby, was "the cardinal's right-hand man." It is not difficult to recognize Mgr. Fay's abode on the Hackensack in the "rambling structure on a hill overlooking the river," where "lived its owner between his trips to all parts of the Roman Catholic world, rather like an exiled Stuart King waiting to be called to the rule of his land." Except the bracketed part it was true that "he was intensely ritualist, i.e., startlingly dramatic, loved the idea of God enough to be a celibate and rather liked his neighbour. Children adored him because he was still like a child; youth revelled in his company because he was still a youth and could not be shocked. In the proper land and century he might have been a Richelieu. At present he was a very moral, very religious (if not particularly pious) clergyman making a great mystery about pulling rusty wires." Mgr. Fay was a Society priest in a country where they are very rare, but he was pious even to mysticism. It is not true that "he could dazzle an Embassy ball," but he could go straight from a party to give a convent Retreat which could be appreciated by such good judges as the Carmelites. He never refused, though he sometimes forgot, an invitation to preach. His feverish activity was not an attempt to drown misgivings, but to make up for time lost outside

This Side of Paradise

the Church in the guise of an Anglican Archdeacon. He used to say that his conversion was not a leap into the dark, but a bound to the Arms of God, and in those Arms he was wont to jump for joy! Like Mgr. Benson, he felt his time was short, and he combined a number of distinct occupations. He was confidential friend and "Colonel House" to Cardinal Gibbons. He was a perpetually travelling preacher, and when not salving souls in New York or Washington he was headmaster of the Newman School. The boys are said to have specially celebrated the first twenty-four hours he spent consecutively in the school. He could put Catholicism to the literary or luxurious with approved paradox. "The more Pagan we look the more Christian we are," he used to say in his pursuit of those who babbled Baudelaire.

That the Church crushes the life out of enlisting converts is not a theme holding water. Gentlemen-rankers like Benson and Fay have been allowed their adventurous will. They gave up Anglican diminutives for the Catholic crescendo. Unfettered by Diocesan or Order they played through the Church, delighting fellow-converts and amusing the old Catholics. Their freedom in speech and script won them the purple. Amid the roar of life they cried aloud the contemplative calm which they so obviously had not found! They had found the Faith, however, and with it they merrily teased the world they had not left. But it was very good for the world, and, like mystical bees, they rushed from experience to experience and soul to soul, gathering honey for the Queen Bee of Heaven. They delighted the children of this world away from the delights thereof. They carried on a running mission by typewriter or telegram or postcard. They taught that the conventional sins were rather early Victorian and that it required a *fin de siècle* intelligence to appreciate the Mass.

Anyhow to the artistic and egotist, like the author of this book, they gave their best. "Why do I make lists?" Amory asked the Monsignor one night, "lists of all sorts of things?" "Because you're a mediævalist," Mon-

Some Recent Books

signor answered. "We both are. It's the passion for classifying and finding a type." "I was beginning to think I was growing eccentric till I came up here. It was a pose, I guess." "Don't worry about that, for you not posing may be the biggest pose of all . . ." Such was Fay admonishing an old pupil, but it might have been Benson talking to a Cambridge undergraduate. Mgr. "Darcy" agrees with his pupil on Mysticism, Prince Charlie, Hannibal, the Southern Confederacy, and to complete his education insists on a hate of mathematics and an Irish bias!

In his circle is "Thornton Hancock," the late Henry Adams, "author of an erudite history of the Middle Ages and the last of a distinguished and patriotic family"; though some would be surprised at the author's hint that though "respected by half the intellectual world as an authority on life, an educator of educators, an adviser to Presidents, yet Amory knew that this man had in his heart leaned on the priest of another religion." If Henry Adams leaned on Mgr. Fay, the British Ambassador during the war leaned on Henry Adams. On Mgr. Fay's other arm leaned Cardinal Gibbons. When matters were rocky for the Embassy, Cecil Spring-Rice took refuge with the wise Henry Adams. When America's testiness at the Blockade was rated by the Foreign Office, it was Henry Adams who remembered the time when his father was persuading England to accept the Blockade Lincoln had imposed on the South, and gave Spring-Rice unanswerable parallels to stand within. But these were not flaunted, as it was understood the President did not like to be impressed in public. Spring-Rice was well advised to play the simpleton and let himself be taken for an outwitted fool. Mgr. Fay doubtless was answerable for "the Irish bias" and aspirations for Irish freedom which Spring-Rice was held to hold. Whether converting a soul or advising a Government, Fay took the mystic line. But he was practically invaluable, for he knew the thought of the Church and much that is hidden from diplomatists. As far as there was any personal diplomacy emanating

This Side of Paradise

from the Embassy it was guided by the sum wisdom of the three, and of the three Fay was the most impetuous and decisive. If he occasionally pulled "a rusty wire," he only laughed when it gave an uncertain sound. It was Fay who originated the policy early in the war of making Redmond Premier in Ireland, with an Irish Brigade in the French Army, and then using a pacified Irish-America to prop up Wilson's wobbly war policy. Spring-Rice avenged his unpopularity at the White House with little epigrams which swept Washington like forked lightning. "Wilson is the little shepherd of his people, and McAdoo is his crook" was one, and another submerged Bryan. On one occasion he showed temper in the State Department, and Fay only smoothed matters by explaining to the President's Secretary that it was an Irish temper and not an English sulk! With this explanation the authorities expressed themselves content. Likewise when the President was remiss in answering a letter of the Cardinal, it was Fay who swooped on the White House and would not leave until he had carried off a cordial autograph. The Cardinal learnt to prize the devotion of his convert-satellite, who, he remarked, would have torn out his eyes for him. The Irish Rising and the Dublin executions brought real anxiety to Washington. A strong message from the Cardinal halted the executions, including that of Mr. De Valera. Fay himself refused to go to the Embassy, and said Mass for the Irish Martyrs with streaming eyes. Spring-Rice told him that the shots in Dublin had knelled the doom of the British Empire and Fay felt he could continue to help a "fellow-Gael in distress." A year later an unwilling America entered the war, with the disgusted Irish-Americans nevertheless first in the fighting van. The Cardinals put the garnered strength of Catholic physique and mentality at the service of the American Government. Catholics were quickly invited into the War Cabinet. Fay sped Rome-ward in complicated guise. The Headmaster of Newman and consoler of perplexed Ambassadors became a Red Cross major in Italy. The mystery which surrounded

Some Recent Books

him at Hackensack followed him to Europe. He reached the Vatican, followed by the Secret Service of three nations. A lightning visit to the White House enabled him to give the Pope a very clear view of American intentions in the conduct of the war. He also took the occasion to remove any dust which might have collected on the standing of Archbishops Gibbons and Ireland in Rome. Remembering the fate which befell Ananias in addressing Peter, he said he did his best to escape the same by speaking frankly, and the Pontiff enjoying frankness, made him a prelate on the spot.

Meantime Spring-Rice's troubles were far from over. The British propaganda proved more upsetting than even the German. While the American Catholics were amounting to a larger proportion in the services than had been dreamed of, while bishops and people were straining every nerve, a blatant and vindictive propaganda was started against Ireland. Pictures of Irish bishops with the leer of Germanism were supplied to the Protestant Press. It was heartily announced that the Irish-American influence had been downed for ever. Spring-Rice and Fay could not temper the folly or restore sobriety, though Spring-Rice assured one propagandist, who offered to negotiate the diplomatic tight-rope, that as long as it was only the rope which was tight all was well! Spring-Rice was too Irish and Catholic in his sympathies, and his success seemed a slight to others. At a moment's notice resignation was thrust upon him. Without a word of cheer he passed out into the Canadian snows and died, a courageous man, carrying only with him, like a passport into eternity, a letter of glowing benediction from the Cardinal whom Fay so faithfully served.

Henry Adams only survived him by a few weeks, but not without deducing the purgatorial smile with which Spring-Rice would have witnessed his own memorial service at Washington, whereat Wilson led the hymns and Lord Reading the responses in tones of unaffected piety. Henry Adams himself threatened to enliven his own obsequies by becoming a Catholic at the last moment

This Side of Paradise

if it was only for the fun of perplexing Boston. But he died before Fay returned from Rome, though he used to say, again and again, "Father Fay will come and tell us all things." Only a candle from Our Lady of Chartres burned in his death chamber to associate his memory with that mediævalism he had not failed to understand. Fay came home with a thousand threads in his hand. He still hoped to make Irish freedom the keystone to Anglo-American amity. He had conversed with Balfour. He had schemed for the Pope to be represented at the Peace. He planned the tour of the Catholic bishops sent by France and England to visit America. He was on the point of carrying out a visitation of the Greek churches in the States. His bishopric was actually on the way from Rome when he died of the 'flu in the hospitable bed of Dr. McMahon at Our Lady of Lourdes in New York. His funeral is accurately transcribed into Mr. Fitzgerald's book: "Amory kept thinking how Monsignor would have enjoyed his own funeral. It was magnificently Catholic and liturgical . . . the inexorable shears had cut through all the threads that Monsignor had gathered into his hand. To Amory it was a haunting grief to see him lying in his coffin with closed hands and purple vestments . . . the church was full of people with staring faces, the most exalted seeming the most stricken. The Cardinal, like an Archangel in cope and mitre, sprinkled the holy water . . . these people had leaned on Monsignor's faith, his way of finding cheer, of making religion a thing of lights and shadows, making all light and shadow merely aspects of God. People felt safe when he was near."

Within so short a span the three friends were dead, and all left posthumous literature. We have already reviewed Henry Adams' *Education*. Mgr. Fay and Spring-Rice left *Poems* which, in the latter's case, has been edited by Bernard Holland (Longmans), and includes the fine sonnets originally printed in the DUBLIN and vaguely attributed to Mansur, the Persian mystic, who was crucified in the Tenth Century for crying, "I am the

Some Recent Books

true One!" Amid his torments he could say, "God herein treats me as a friend treats his friend. He passes to me the Cup of suffering which He has first drunk Himself," and Mr. Holland asks, "Was this a distant echo of the earlier cry in a Garden near Jerusalem?" Mr. Holland sees in Spring-Rice's work "the creation of tranced vision in the night of the senses working upon material stored in the day of the senses." Immeasurably fine is the Sonnet on St. Augustine, and fitted to the times which the writer did not live to breast:

The crash of empires echoed in his ears,
The shouts and curses of the ravening horde;
Flashed in his eyes the horror of the sword,
The blight that gnaws and spreads, the fire that sears;
And dimly through a mist of hopeless tears
He saw the old heroic blood outpoured,
A flood of ruin, swift and deep and broad,
That whelmed the glories of a thousand years.

And even as the darkness darker grows,
And nearer yet the tempest looms and lowers,
Lo! where afar a strange new splendour shows
Through storm and darkness softly glimmering.
The shining bulwarks, the eternal towers,
The courts divine, the Palace of the King.

A letter to Mr. Bryan written the night before Spring-Rice left Washington is included, and a gay irony seems to underlie its warmth. He hails Bryan, the mulish opponent and obstacle to all his diplomacy, as the hero of the day! "The great objects which you have so long advocated at such costs and with such a sacrifice are now on the eve of fulfilment. National temperance, suffrage, national ownership, here they are. Is it not wonderful? The greatest object of all will, I hope, at last, be permanently established, Peace!" But hardly in Bryan's way. However, Spring-Rice felt he had liberated his soul and was in a mood to be all things to all men. He took his dismissal from his well-fought post in the spirit of Mansur, the Persian mystic, and his last words were to cheer his

First World War

sorrowful friends who only felt with Sophoclean indignation,

οἱ ἔργα δράσας οἷα λαγχάνει κακά

The three friends were perhaps happy in their deaths, for they would not have cared to see the gross mishandling of the few remaining assets of civilization or the two English-speaking democracies being permanently estranged, or Ireland made a faggot to burn the slender thread between the British Government and the American people, who now occupy diametrically opposite poles as to what is meant by the government of the governed. How bitterly, sadly, and cynically they would have summed up all that has happened. How fatally true have many of their casual words been proved! To quote a line of Spring-Rice: "The dead spoke. I heard it all!"

S. L.

WE cannot notice Colonel Repington's *First World War* (Constable) except to repudiate the atrocious suggestion that there will be a second, and to call passing attention to the chapter on "Italy and the Vatican." The writer was in good hands during his Roman mission, and has the fairness to record views at strong variance from the *Morning Post*, with which he was connected. Count de Salis had been informed that the Jesuit General was a German (a typical official remark), "whereas he is, of course, an Austrian Pole." De Salis thought Cardinal Gasparri and Repington the two first military critics in Europe! We think De Salis the first diplomatist in Europe. Mr. Bogey Harris told him "that the Vatican are pro-Vatican and not pro-German." The Pope, according to Mr. Harris, "was a dark horse, and it was not known whether he was very intelligent or the reverse. The Pope's knowledge of seas was confined to the Vatican fountains!" This is spoiling a good story of Mgr. Duchesne who, when asked why the Pope was interested in the freedom of the seas, replied that he wished a free passage for the Bark of Peter. The interview with Gasparri is told in great detail and with many minor asides. For instance, "No blotting-paper! The Vatican was not born

Some Recent Books

yesterday!" The Papal guard are "antediluvian butterflies," etc. As for the Cardinal, "witty and fond of a joke. A strong self-confident personality, well armed with information on every point we discussed; quick, alert and combative," but why add, "In the Borgia days I should not have cared to dine with him had he disliked me"? He arranged a frank correspondence between Vatican and Whitehall, saying, "We were Conservatives with strong desire for order, discipline and good government, and that the Vatican had similar views and that it seemed to me folly for us to waste our time attacking each other when we both had the same enemies, such as the Bolsheviks and anarchists of all countries . . . as an old Intelligence officer I took off my hat to the best as well as to the oldest Intelligence Service in the world, and wished to make use of it in a common cause. The Cardinal listened . . ."

Later we learn, "Harris declares the Vatican to be the household cat of Europe, and whenever anything is lost, or the cream disappears, the cat is accused. De Salis says that when the Boche gets beaten he beats his prisoners, and when we get beaten we beat the Vatican." We get a pleasing picture of Cardinal Gasquet and his views, whereat our writer: "If these are correct and the Vatican publishes accounts of its proceedings during the war I should say that it will come better out of things than most Governments. I was told that the Pope promised to make a great protest to the world if a single case could be proved of the violation of Belgian nuns or of the cutting off of children's hands. An inquiry was instituted, and many cases examined, with the help of Cardinal Mercier. Not one case could be proved. One handless child was found, but the evidence pointed to the mother having amputated the child's hands for purposes of begging! Little of the good work done by the Vatican *re* prisoners seems to have been acknowledged." We learn that "Pope Benedict's election, like Bonar Law's, was due to a division of opinion about two other rival candidates for the Papacy. He was the *tertius gaudens*."

St. John the Evangelist

I do not believe him to be either pro-German or pro-Austrian." We only add that there was another *tertius gaudens* in one case, the Third Person of the Trinity. So far so good, but there is a lamentable indiscretion when this British missionary decides, but clearly not as a result of consultation with Fr. Philip Langdon, that "it would be better for us to foster and watch the Irish College here than to boom Maynooth. It would be best to close Maynooth. But we should keep an eye on the training staff at the Irish College here and see that proper men are appointed to teach!" We only hope no copy of the book will reach the eye of the Heads of those two apostolic institutions, or the reputation of English diplomacy in Rome will be impaired. On the next page there is another unfortunate phrase, "I think that the moral forces which the Vatican controls and the political weight that comes from them are very great. A restored Poland and an America one-third Catholic will increase the Vatican's power, but it will take a man of courage and far sight in England to draw the right conclusions." It will indeed.

Colonel Repington's military views were grimly truthful, and the feeble social limelight in which he places himself need not obscure his loyalty to the soldiers and his noble contempt of the politicians. No chiel had the right to take notes of the frivolous moments of women who were otherwise pulling their humble weight in the war. A number of political reputations crumple up before his pen, and incidentally the gentle art of conversation. Who in future will dare to be witty or spontaneous when Colonel Repington is in the room? Who would believe that these social snapshots were penned by the writer of the *Lost Legion*?

S. L.

AMONG all the various books with which Fr. Martindale has enriched our Catholic literature there is, perhaps, not one for which his readers will be more grateful than for his latest volume in the series of "The Household of God," a careful study of *St. John the Evangelist* (Burns, Oates, and Washbourne), with the

Some Recent Books

object of making its deepest treasures more accessible to those who cannot read the Greek for themselves, and who, even if they could, would miss most of its value for want of a guide. Not the least of the services which Fr. Martindale has done is to give us a new translation of some of the most important passages—a translation which tries to give us the real value of the Greek words, even though sometimes at the expense of the fluency of the English, and which also brings out, by the semi-poetic way in which it is printed in separate lines, something of the underlying rhythm which pervades the Greek and of the parallel structure, so distinctive of Hebrew poetry, in which the sustained argument is so frequently cast.

The book is not written primarily from a critical standpoint, and questions of criticism are never obtruded upon us, but at the same time one feels that they have all been faced carefully and honestly met by the author before he wrote down his solution of the various points at issue. His object has been rather, granting all due weight to the arguments, very often of real value for the right understanding of the Gospel, which have been put forward by the critics to give us a clue by which we may follow the Evangelist's thought for ourselves. Only so shall we understand how much lies beneath the surface and make due allowance as we read for the influence of the sixty years of Christian sacramental life which divide the telling of the story from the events which form its historical basis. There were things said and done then by our Lord, as St. John frankly tells us, which none of the disciples, not even John himself, fully understood at the time. There were some even, as again he admits, which were entirely misunderstood. Only afterwards, as he lived the life, had he come fully to understand; and yet, as St. Augustine reminds us, not even he ever quite fully; "for he spoke of God being but man, inspired indeed by God, yet still a man." So "he spake, being a man inspired, not all that is; but, what a man can speak, that spake he." (St. Aug., *Tr. in Joan*, i. 1.) No careful

History of Everyday Things

student of the Gospel nowadays can help being aware of the difficulty, which meets us again and again, of deciding the exact point at which, in the intention of the Evangelist, the reported words of our Lord are to be held to end, and the inspired comment of the Evangelist to begin. On this point Fr. Martindale is particularly clear and helpful. "Insensibly," he writes, "the divine speech melts into the Evangelist's. For a few sentences the one shines through the other, like a sapphire through a diamond. Then you can see distinctly that it is John who thinks and writes."

Not less important is the insistence again and again that we must not narrow the application of St. John's thought. This thought "is not single." There are always associated ideas which he must have had in his mind, and which inevitably, even if only half-consciously, influenced his expression. Take, for example, the phrase "born again of water and of the Spirit." Of course the words associated themselves inevitably after sixty years of priesthood with Christian baptism. But they also must have brought to his mind the lustrations of the Jews, which at best could only purify in part but could give no life. And, further, there can scarcely have been absent the memory of that Spirit which at the beginning brooded over the waters. If we would understand his teaching, we must try to realize all, and not part only, of what was in his mind. To sum up. We are really grateful to Fr. Martindale for a most illuminative and helpful study. He will have made the Gospel of St. John live for a great many of his readers as it did not before, and that alone is a very great achievement in which he will find his full reward.

A. S. B.

A BOOK much out of the common and singularly attractive to any but the most phlegmatic Englishman is *A History of Everyday Things in England*, by M. and C. M. B. Quennell (1066-1499—1500-1799) (Batsford). It is history, since it tells us of the past; but it tells us how things have come about, not simply that they were;

Some Recent Books

their development and decline, rather than events. A framework of political history is constructed as briefly as possible and with a studied fairness ; and we may surely take it as a mere inadvertence that whereas the French war of the Fourteenth Century is properly condemned, no suitable qualification is attached to the buccaneering exploits of later times, or the economic wars of the Eighteenth Century. The reader will condone the common misconception about indulgences (II, 13) and the implication of the extension of grammar schools under Edward VI (II, p. 23) ; but the reference to the angels and the point of a needle had better be substantiated or dropped out of literature. The identification of prebend and canonry we believe to be inaccurate. In other respects the volumes have afforded us the keenest delight, and both equally so, though from different points of view. The former struck us as a sympathetic, not to say enthusiastic, account of the simpler lives of our ancestors, the latter seemed to express a reposeful satisfaction in the growth and splendour of the days that followed. Of their particular contribution the authors themselves make the modest profession that "our space is limited, our subject large, our own knowledge small." Subjects which stand out prominently in the memory after a perusal of the two parts, are building, shipping, mills and dress. Each chapter deals with a century, and is headed with the figure of a horseman of the period, and has a contemporary ornament for tail-piece. Clearly the writers revel in the life history, if we may so speak, of buildings, whose arrangement, organic parts, construction and ornamentation are described as processes of growth. Among the buildings, churches and monasteries have the chief place in Volume I, and mansions in Volume II. The description of the monastic buildings and the life of the monks leaves nothing to be desired, except that convents and nuns are almost forgotten, and that the authors fail to discern the value and power of the motive which governed the secluded life of the Carthusian.

H. P.

A ROLL OF HONOUR

MESSAGES TO THE BEREAVED

FROM CARDINAL MERCIER

Human speech cannot cure the wounds which separation leaves in the heart. However, at this moment when a Roll of Honour of Catholics in Great Britain is being drawn up, let this thought be a consolation to those who have lost a son, a father, a brother, or a loved one, on which I have often meditated myself as a rest from the scenes of horror which the War brought under our eyes ; a thought which has more than once comforted, I know, suffering souls among my compatriots.

All that there is of the good, the grand, the noble in the creature is found to a higher degree in the Creator ; the river-waters have all their crystalline purity at their fount.

The heroism of our soldiers commands our admiration ; there is nobody who does not bow before them with respect.

How should God not welcome them with love ?

✠ D.J. CARD. MERCIER, ARCHBP. OF MALINES.

Malines, Sept. 25th, 1920.

FROM CARDINAL BOURNE

When we contemplate the lot of those who gave up their young lives so nobly in the War, sorrow indeed may well fill our hearts, but for them there should be no repining.

They gave their best. So far as this world is concerned they gave their all. And in God's sight so great a sacrifice for love of country, in defence of right, and for duty's sake must atone for many a boyish weakness, and for any youthful frailty. Doubtless in that last moment, even if not earlier, His Divine light illumined them, awakening them to a sense of revealed truth, and to the recognition of and to contrition for sin.

Thus we may look back upon their lives with reverent affection, and upon their deaths with well-assured confidence. May they rest in peace, and may God grant them in their rest the reward of all their hopes and deeds.

FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

October, 1920.

NOTE.

THIS Catholic Roll of Honour, containing nearly 1,500 names of officers and a few names inseparable from theirs in the ranks, was compiled during the war by the staff of the *Catholic Who's Who*, by whom it is now placed at our disposal. It cannot be complete, but corrections and additions will be received for future publication.

A ROLL OF HONOUR

- Agius**, Capt. Richard Victor, London Regt.
- Ahern**, Lt. and Q.M. Patrick Joseph, 7 Leinster Regt.
- Ainscough**, Lt. Cyril, Manchester Regt.
- Aldous**, Capt. Stewart John, 5 Sherwood Foresters.
- Algar**, Capt. Arthur Patrick, 24 Punjaubis.
- Allan**, Lt. Myrton T., 20 Bn., A.I.F.
- Allanson**, Sec.-Lt. H. P., 2 Suffolk Regt.
- Allanson**, Lt. Wilfrid George, R.A.F.
- Allen**, Sec.-Lt. A. J. B., 17 (2 N. Wales) R. Welsh Fusiliers.
- Allgood**, Sec.-Lt. George, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Amoroso**, Lt. Michele, 95 Bde, R.F.A.
- Anderson**, Lt. Alan James Ramsay, R. Irish Regt.
- Anderson**, Sec.-Lt. Philip Maurice Ramsay, R. Irish Regt.
- Anne**, Capt. Crathorne Edward Isham Charlton, R.F.C.
- Anton**, Lt. Edwin Vincent, Gordon Highlanders.
- Archer-Shee**, Lt. George S., Staffs Regt.
- Arnold**, Capt. Bernard William, R.F.A.
- Arnold**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph, Manchester Regt.
- Arnott**, Lt. David W., R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Aston**, Capt. Walter Douglas, Cambs Regt.
- Atchison**, Sec.-Lt. John Osborne, 5 K.O. Yorks L.I. (T.F.).
- Bagshawe**, Capt. Edward George Clarkson, 5 Yorks Regt.
- Baillon**, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Wulstan, 3 King's Liverpool Regt.
- Baily**, Sec.-Lt. Denis Joseph, M.C., 7 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Baines**, Sec.-Lt. George, Middlesex Regt. and R.F.C.
- Baines**, Sec.-Lt. John Hugh, 10 Lincolnshire Regt.
- Baines**, Capt. Joseph, 20 Middlesex Rifles.
- Baines**, Rev. Thomas L., C.F. (diocese of Liverpool).
- Ball**, Lt. John J., R.F.A. (T.F.).
- Bamford**, Capt. Oswald Joseph, 1/6 N. Staffs. Regt.
- Bankes-Price**, Flight Lt. John Thearesby, R.N.
- Barbé**, Lt. A. E., R.N.
- Barlow**, Capt. John E., 3 Bn. A.I.F.
- Barnett**, Sec.-Lt. Allan G., King's Liverpool Regt.
- Barnewall**, Sec.-Lt. Hon. Reginald Nicholas Francis M., Leinster Regt.
- Barr**, Sec.-Lt. John W., R.F.C.
- Barrett**, Sec.-Lt. Bernard, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Barrett**, Surgeon James, M.B., B.Ch., R.N.
- Barrett**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Gordon, M.C.
- Barrington**, Sec.-Lt. Noel Scott, R. Irish Rifles.
- Barrow**, Sub-Lt. John Gerald, R.N.
- Barry**, Sec.-Lt. William Roche Brereton, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Bartlett**, Midshipman Geoffrey E.R., R.N.
- Barton**, Lt. James, M.C., Croix de Guerre, R.G.A.
- Bate**, Sec.-Lt. George Beaumont, 3 Loyal N. Lancs Regt. and R.A.F.
- Baynes**, Capt. Nigel Francis, Glos. Regt.
- Beard**, Lt. Philip L., 14 R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Beaudry**, Lt. A. P., Canadian Inf. Bn.
- Beauset**, Capt. M. E., 22 French Canadian Inf. Bn.
- Bellasis**, Capt. Philip J., K. Shropshire L.I.
- Bellasis**, William Joseph, Bowker's Horse.
- Bellew**, Sec.-Lt. Richard Courtenay, Irish Guards.
- Bellingham**, Capt. Roger Charles, R.F.A.
- Belloc**, Lt. Louis Mary John, R.E., attd R.A.F.
- Bellord**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Edmund, R.A.F.
- Belzile**, Lt. C. E., 22 French Canadian Inf.
- Bergin**, Capt. the Rev. Michael, S.J., M.C., attd 13 Australian F.A. Bde, A.I.F.

A Roll of Honour

- Berkeley**, Col. Thomas Mowbray M., Black Watch.
- Bernard**, Lt. Bernard Frederick Paul, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Berners**, Capt. Hamilton Hugh, Irish Guards.
- Berrill**, Lt. Bernard F.G., 4 R. Fus.
- Bethell**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Francis Tohill, R.E.
- Beveridge**, Capt. James O'Shaughnessy, M.B., R.A.M.C.
- Bickerdike**, Capt. Robert, M.C., W. Yorks Regt.
- Bickford**, Major Arthur Louis, C.I.E., 56 Rifles F.F.
- Bicknell**, Capt. Herman Kentigern, Oxford and Bucks L.I.
- Bicknell**, Sec.-Lt. Herman Bysshe Bagshawe, Yorkshire Regt.
- Bidwell**, Midshipman Leonard John, R.N.
- Binet**, Lt. J. L., 22 French Canadian Bn.
- Binns**, Sec.-Lt. Raymund Lewis, 3 Yorks Regt.
- Birdwood**, Lt. Herbert Frederick, 20 London Regt. (attd. R.F.C.).
- Bispham**, Sec.-Lt. David Charles, R.F.C.
- Blake**, Lt. Cecil, R. Irish Regt.
- Blake**, Lt. Harold M. J., R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Blake**, Capt. Valentine Charles Joseph, 1 Irish Guards.
- Bodenham**, Sec.-Lt. Hyacinth E. C. H., Machine Gun Co.
- Bonney**, Sec.-Lt. J. P.
- Bonnyman**, Capt. Edward William, D.S.O., M.C., Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders.
- Boucher**, Sec.-Lt. Adolphe Albert, Shropshire L.I., attd. 8 T.M.B.
- Bouchette**, Lt. E. E., Quebec Regt.
- Boulton**, Lt. Christian Harold Ernest, Cameron Highlanders.
- Bourchier**, Sec.-Lt. Arthur George Evelyn, 2 R. Berks Regt.
- Bourgeois**, Lt. R., Quebec Regt.
- Bowring**, Capt. Francis Stephen, 22 Punjabis.
- Boyhan**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas F., R. Irish Rifles.
- Boyle**, Lt. John Kenny, M.C., R. Irish Rifles.
- Bracelin**, Sec.-Lt. Daniel, Black Watch.
- Bradford**, Lt. Bertrand Hamilton Malcolm, R.N.
- Bradley**, Sec.-Lt. Robert Francis, 7 North Staffs Regt.
- Bradney**, Capt. Philip Edwin, 6 Somerset L.I.
- Brandreth**, Arthur Killingworth Bourne, Pte., R. Fusiliers (P.S. and Univ. Bn.).
- Brannigan**, Sec.-Lt. E. E., West Yorkshire Regt.
- Brayden**, Sec.-Lt. Kevin, London Irish Rifles.
- Breen**, Major T. F. Pennefather, R.A.M.C.
- Brennan**, Lt. H. J., R.A.F.
- Brennan**, Lt. Jeremiah, Lancs Hussars (attd Intelligence Corps).
- Brett**, Sec.-Lt. Frank Joseph, Manchester Regt.
- Brewitt**, Sec.-Lt. W. Sydney, R.E.
- Britten**, Lt.-Col. Thomas Xavier, 110 Mahratta L.I.
- Brockbank**, Siegfried Harrison, Pte., 7 Middlesex Regt.
- Broderick**, Lt. Thomas J., 6 R. Irish Regt.
- Brodrick**, Lt. Edward, Manchester Regt.
- Brooks**, Sec.-Lt. Harold Brendan, 7 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Brooman**, Sec.-Lt. Edward James, M.C., Lancs Fusiliers.
- Broomhall**, Sec.-Lt. Oscar Arthur, R.F.C.
- Brophy**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Joseph, Leinster Regt.
- Brown**, Capt. Charles Adrian, R.A.F.
- Brown**, Sec.-Lt. Frederick A., R. Fusiliers.
- Brown**, Capt. John Carolan, M.C., Conn. Rangers, attd. Tank Corps.
- Brown**, Sec.-Lt. Richard Stanley, 14 Cheshire Regt.
- Browne**, Hon. Dermot, Lt. and Adj., 1 Coldstream Guards.
- Browne**, Lt. Peter, Conn. Rangers, attd. R.I. Fusiliers.
- Brownrigg**, Lt. Thomas, R.A.F.
- Bruce**, Capt. Charles William, Gordon Highlanders, attd. R.F.C.
- Buckley**, Capt. Hugh Cornelius, Australian Infantry.
- Buckley**, Capt. Joseph Michael, M.C., Rifle Bde.
- Bulbeck**, Lt. Henry Edmund, 20 R. Fusiliers.
- Bulkley**, Capt. Edmund Burke Mabbot, The King's Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Bulkley**, Capt. Howel Steven, Indian Infantry.
- Bunbury**, Lt. Wilfrid Joseph, 4 Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Burdess**, Rev. Matthew, D.D., Ph.D., C.F.
- Burge**, Major and Bt.-Lt.-Col. Norman Ormsby, R.M.L.I.
- Buriureaux**, Lt. J. René C., Tyne-side Irish, Northumberland Fus.
- Burke**, Lt. Frank M., R. Newfoundland Regt.
- Burke**, Lt. Henry Joseph, S. Staffs Regt.
- Burke**, Capt. John Bernard Mary, M.C., Grenadier Guards.
- Burke**, Lt. John Errill, 5 Connaught Rangers.
- Burke**, Sec.-Lt. J. W., R.I.R.
- Burke**, Sec.-Lt. Martin, W. Yorks Regt.
- Burke-Forster**, Rudolph, attd. London Rifles.
- Burkinshaw**, Capt. Francis William, M.C., R.F.A.
- Burnand**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril Francis, Grenadier Guards.
- Burns**, Sec.-Lt. David Chalmers, The Black Watch.
- Burt**, Lt. Stanley F., King's Liverpool Regt.
- Buss**, Lt. Hilary Thomas, R.F.C.
- Bussy**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril Ignatius V., S. Staffs Regt.
- Bussy**, Sec.-Lt. Julian Herbert, S. Staffs Regt.
- Butler**, Major Edmund William, 2 Life Guards, attd. 8 Glos Regt.
- Butler**, Lt. Leonard W., R. I. Fus.
- Butler-Bowdon**, Sec.-Lt. Basil Joseph Bernard, Lancs Fusiliers.
- Butt**, Sergt. Austin, M.G.C.
- Butti**, Cpl. James A., Black Watch.
- Butters**, Sec.-Lt. Harry Augustus, R.F.A.
- Byrne**, Sec.-Lt. Edward Aloysius, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Byrne**, Capt. Harold Vyvian Edward, M.C., Norfolk Regt.
- Byrne**, Lt. John Gilbert, 37 Dogras, I.A.
- Byrne**, Sec.-Lt. Leo Francis, R. Irish Regt.
- Byrne**, Lt. Louis F., Tyneside Irish.
- Byrne**, Capt. Patrick Antony Langgan-, D.S.O., R.F.A. and R.F.C.
- Byrne**, Sec.-Lt. Edmund Thomas Edward, Welsh Guards.
- Byrne**, Sec.-Lt. Vincent Connel, R.I.R.
- Cadic**, Capt. Bernard Francis, R.G.A.
- Cadic**, Capt. Lawrence William Ludovic, M.C., Essex Regt.
- Cahill**, Capt. John Archibald, M.C., R. Berks Regt.
- Cahill**, Capt. John Nugent, R. Irish Rifles.
- Cahill**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Leopold, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Cahill**, Lt. T. K., Australian Force.
- Cahill**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Laurence, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Cain**, Harold J., Pte., Liverpool Regt.
- Calderwood**, Sec.-Lt. Alexander Taylor, 10 Hants Regt.
- Callaghan**, Major Joseph Cruess, M.C., R.A.F.
- Callaghan**, Sec.-Lt. Owen Eugene Cruess, R.F.C.
- Callaghan**, Capt. Stanislaus Cruess, R.F.C.
- Callaghan**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Patrick Aloysius, M.G.C.
- Callary**, Capt. Philip Ignatius, 9 Australian Light Horse.
- Campbell**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Arthur, Cheshire Regt.
- Cannin**, Sub-Lt. H., R.N.V.R.
- Cannon**, Lt. R., 5 Wilts Regt.
- Carden**, Lce.-Cpl. Donald Leo, 2 Devon Regt.
- Carew**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril Joseph Theodore, 2 E. Yorks Regt.
- Carey**, Lt. Thomas J., 25 Bn., Australian Infantry.
- Carey**, Rev. Timothy, S.J., C.F.
- Carless**, Ordinary Seaman John Henry, V.C., R.N.
- Carlisle**, Lt. Reginald Henry, R.N.R.
- Carmichael**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Sydney, Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
- Carr**, Lt. Edgar Joseph Austin, 4 K.O.R. Lancs Regt.
- Carroll**, Lt. James C., R.G.A., attd. Tank Corps.
- Carroll**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick, Leinster Regt.
- Carroll**, Capt. William, M.C., E. Yorkshire Regt.
- Cary**, Sec.-Lt. Launcelot Sulyarde Robert, Devonshire Regt.
- Cary-Elwes**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid Ger-vaseq Irish Guards.

A Roll of Honour

- Casey**, Flight-Comdr. Francis Dominic, D.S.C., R.N.
Casey, Lt. Michael F., 9 R. Munster Fusiliers.
Casserley, Flight-Comdr. Cyril Ignatius, R.A.F.
Cassidy, Sec.-Lt. Bernard M., Irish Guards.
Cassidy, Sec.-Lt. Bernard Matthew, V.C., Lancs Fusiliers.
Cassidy, Chief Gnr. Joseph, R.N.
Cavanagh, Lt. Patrick Felix, R. Scots.
Cavanagh, Sec.-Lt. Thomas J., R. Irish Rifles.
Chadwick, Sec.-Lt. Francis Joseph, Beds Regt.
Chamberlain, Eng. Peter Augustine, Admiralty Transport.
Charlton, Lt. Cecil, E. R. Yorks Yeomanry.
Chester-Walsh, Lt. Cecil, 1/5 London Regt.
Chesterton, Cecil, Pte., Highland Light Infantry.
Chichester, Capt. Edmund Basil, The Buffs.
Chichester, Lt. Robert C., R.N.
Chisholm, Sec.-Lt. Alistair Edward, 11 R. Scots.
Chisholm, Lt. Roderick John, R.A.F.
Chislett, Lt. A. R. J., Highland L.I., (T.F.).
Christie, Capt. James, R.I.R.
Chronnell, Capt. Hubert, M.C., Loyal N. Lancs.
Chubb, Lt. Alan Travers, Hants Regt.
Clancey, Lt. Trevor John, Border Regt.
Clancy, Lt. George David Louis, R. Irish Rifles.
Clareborough, Lt. C. A. W., Australian I.F.
Clark, Capt. Basil Lyon, K. Afr. Rifles.
Clarke, Capt. Eric Fitzgerald, 3 London Regt.
Clarke, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Wilfrid Francis, R.A.F.
Clarke, Rev. Stephen, C.F., attd. Lancs Fus. (diocese of Kilmore).
Clarke, Sec.-Lt. T. H., E. Lancs Regt.
Clayton, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Edward Crie, M.A., R. Marines, R.N.D.
Clayton, Francis Heriot, Pte., 21 Service Bn., R. Fusiliers.
Clerke, Lt. Cyril, E. Surrey Regt.
Clery, Capt. Noel Cairns, M.C., R.F.A.
Clery, Lt. Daniel Richard, 6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Clifford, Brigadier-Gen. Henry Frederick Hugh, D.S.O.
Clifford, Lt. Hugh Gilbert Francis, Lincoln Regt.
Clifford, Sec.-Lt. Walter Francis Joseph, Irish Guards.
Cloran, Sub-Lt. Gerald J., R.N.R.
Clutterbuck, Sec.-Lt. Bernard Valentine, R.F.A., attd. T.M.B.
Coape-Arnold, Lt. Raymond de Newburgh, S. Staffs Regt. and R.A.F.
Coen, Major Frank, Australian Inf.
Coffee, Lt. F., Australian Infantry.
Coffey, Lt. Charles Reay, R.A.F.
Cogan, Sec.-Lt. Lionel Gatrell, 4 R. Irish Regt.
Cogan, Victor John, Pte., R. Fus.
Coghlan, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Patrick, M.C., R.E.
Coghlan, Lt. Wilfrid Humphrey, R.F.A.
Colahan, John Orr, A.I.F.
Collett, Flight-Comdr. Charles Herbert, D.S.O., R.N.A.S.
Colley, Sec.-Lt. Philip Wellesley, R.F.A.
Collingwood-Thompson, Sec.-Lt. Edward James Vybart, R. Welsh Fusiliers.
Collins, Rev. Herbert J., C.F., attd. Black Watch.
Condon, Lt. Thomas J., R.F.A.
Connée, Lt. John Alphonsus, York and Lancs Regt.
Connor, Lt. William, R.A.F.
Conroy, Lt. Bernard, R. Dublin Fus.
Considine, Major John William, R. Munster Fusiliers.
Considine, Lt. Patrick Francis, 4 R. Scots (T.F.).
Considine, Capt. Heffernan James, M.C., R. Irish Regt.
Considine, Sec.-Lt. Christopher Daniel, 5 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Conway, Major Edgar Philip, 2 (attd. 6) R. Munster Fusiliers.
Conway, Sec.-Lt. Joseph M., R. Lancs Regt.
Cope, Sec.-Lt. Anthony C. P., Shropshire L.I.

A Roll of Honour

- Copner**, Lt. Arthur Bruce, 1 (attd. 8) Devon Regt.
- Coppinger**, Cyril Douglas, Pte., 1 Northants Regt.
- Corbally**, Capt. Louis William R.F.A.
- Corcoran**, Major William J., Middlesex Regt.
- Cordes**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh de Bary, Scots Guards.
- Corish**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas P., King's Liverpool Regt.
- Cormac-Walshe**, Lt. Edward J., Leinster Regt.
- Cormac-Walshe**, Capt. Henry Ignatius, R.F.A.
- Costello**, Lt. Edward William, R. Inniskilling Fusiliers.
- Costello**, Sec.-Lt. Gabriel Patrick, 5 R. Irish Regt.
- Cotter**, Lce.-Cpl. William Richard, V.C., E. Kent Regt.
- Coupland**, Lt. Charles, R.F.A., attd. R.F.C.
- Coventry**, Lt. William St. John, 1 Beds Regt.
- Cravos**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril Stephen, Welsh Regt., attd. R.F.C.
- Creagh**, Capt. Leo, Manchester Regt.
- Creagh**, Sec.-Lt. William, Leinster Regt.
- Crean**, Capt. Theodore, Northants Regt. and R.F.C.
- Cremen**, Lt. Leonard Francis, 14 Sikhs, I.A.
- Cremonini**, Sec.-Lt. Henry James, R.F.C.
- Crichton-Stuart**, Lt.-Col. Lord Ninian, M.P., comdg. 6 Welsh Regt. (T.F.).
- Crochetiere**, Rev. G. C. R., Canadian Chaplain's Service, attd. Quebec Regt.
- Crowley**, Lt. F. A., R.F.C.
- Cruise**, Capt. H. R., S. African Rifles.
- Cryan**, Sec.-Lt. J. S., R.A.F.
- Cuddon**, Oswald Leo.
- Cuffey**, Sec.-Lt. Maurice Edward O'Connor, 3 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Cullimore**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Alfred, R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Cuming**, A/Capt. Arthur Eric M., M.C. and Bar, R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Cunningham**, Sec.-Lt. A. J., London Irish Rifles.
- Cunningham**, Cpl. John, V.C., Leinster Regt.
- Cunningham**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Joseph, R.A.F.
- Curtis**, Capt. Arthur John Powles, K.R.R.C.
- d'Abadie**, Louis L., R. Fusiliers (Sportsman's Bn.).
- Dagge**, Sec.-Lt. Albert L., R.F.A.
- Dalghish**, Capt. Charles Antoine de G., Black Watch.
- Dalrymple**, Lt. John Raphael Hamilton, K.O.S.B.
- Dalton**, Col. Charles, R.A.M.C.
- Dalton**, Sec.-Lt. George Henry Griffiths, 3 R. Irish Fusiliers.
- D'Alton**, Sec.-Lt. James George, R.F.A.
- D'Alton**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Joseph, R. Irish Regt.
- Daly**, Lt. Cecil William, Rifle Bde.
- Daly**, Sec.-Lt. Darby, Connaught Rangers, attd. R.M.F.
- D'Arcy**, Flight-Lt. Lionel George, Connaught Rangers and R.F.C.
- D'Arcy**, Sec.-Lt. Samuel Hollis Alfred, D.S.O., R.A.F.
- Davidson**, Col. William Leslie, C.B., Gentleman Usher to the King.
- Davidson**, Capt. Donald Alastair Leslie, M.C., R.F.C.
- Davies**, Sec.-Lt. Noel J., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Davis**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid Alan Joseph, 4 E. Surrey Regt.
- Davison**, Sec.-Lt. C. W. Joseph, W. Yorks Regt.
- Davison**, Sec.-Lt. H. J. G.
- Davoren**, Sec.-Lt. Ambrose Joseph Stanislaus, R.F.A.
- Dawes**, Sec.-Lt. Oswald Stephen Bernard, N. Staffs Regt. attd. York and Lancs Regt.
- Dawson**, Lt. Philip, R.E.
- Day**, Sec.-Lt. John Charles Sigismund, R. Sussex Regt. and R.F.C.
- Day**, Capt. Shirley Cuthbert, M.C., Sherwood Foresters.
- Dealy**, Lce.-Cpl. Francis Henry Ough, 43 Bn., A.I.F.
- Dealy**, Lt. Thomas Sydney Ough, A.F.C.
- Dean**, Sec.-Lt. Edward B., R.G.A.
- Dease**, Lt. Maurice James, V.C., R. Fusiliers.
- de Bay**, Lt. Michel Spruyt, Canadian Infantry.
- de Castro**, Capt. John Vivian Reynell, 3 Suffolk Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- de Courey**, Sec.-Lt. Henry J.,
Leinster Regt.
- de Freyne**, Arthur Reginald, 5
Baron, Capt. 1 S. Wales Borderers.
- de la Fontaine**, Lt.-Col. Henry Victor
Mottet, D.S.O., E. Surrey Regt.
- Delaney**, Sec.-Lt. J. A. L., K.O.R.,
Lancs Regt.
- de la Pasture**, Capt. Charles E.,
Scots Guards.
- de Lisle**, Lt. Alexander C. N. March
Phillipps, R.F.C.
- Dennys**, Sec.-Lt. Kenneth Rose, 2
R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Densham**, Lt. Walter Henry, M.C.,
R.F.A.
- Dent-Young**, Julius H., Pte., Lon-
don Regt.
- Dent-Young**, Lt. William Thomas,
Australian Infantry.
- Deprez**, Capt. Austin Edward,
R.F.A.
- Derbyshire**, Lt. Wilfrid, M.C., Can-
adian Infantry.
- de Staepoole**, Lt. Robert Antony,
Connaught Rangers.
- de Staepoole**, Sec.-Lt. Roderick Al-
gernon, R.F.A.
- de Trafford**, Capt. Henry Joseph,
S. Staffs Regt.
- de Trafford**, Capt. Thomas Cecil,
R. Fusiliers.
- de Trafford**, Lt. Ralph Eric, R.
Fusiliers.
- de Trafford**, Lt. Reginald Francis,
3 K.O.R. Lancs Regt. attd. 1 Glos.
Regt.
- Devas**, Lt. Bertrand Ward, Suffolk
Regt.
- de Vertenil**, Surg. Ferdinand L. J. M.
M.B., R.N.R.
- Devine**, Lt. P. J., A.I.F.
- Dick**, Lt. Archibald William Douglas,
Scots Guards.
- Dickens**, Major Cedric Charles, Lon-
don Regt.
- Dignan**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph P., Con-
naught Rangers attd. R. Innisk.
- Dignan**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph P., Conn.
Rgrs. attd. R. Innisk. Fusiliers.
- Dignan**, Lt. A. G., S. Irish Gorse,
attd. R. Irish R.
- Dillon**, Lt. Edward Joseph, M.M.,
R.A.F.
- Dinan**, Sec.-Lt. Francis Arthur,
R.F.A.
- Dinan**, Major Frederick Charles,
Essex Regt.
- Dinan**, Sec.-Lt. George Albert, R.
Dublin Fusiliers.
- Dobson**, Lt. Eric O., 8 Sherwood
Foresters.
- Dockrell**, Lce.-Cpl. Herbert Morgan,
Duke of Cornwall's L.I.
- Doheny**, Lt. J. E., Canadian Inf.
- Doherty**, Sec.-Lt. John, R. Dublin
Fusiliers.
- Doherty**, Lt. Joseph, R.G.A.
- Dolan**, Lt. Henry Eric, M.C.,
R.A.F.
- Dolan**, Lt. Stephen C., R. Innisk.
Fusiliers.
- Domegan**, Lt. Christopher Patrick,
R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Donald**, Lt. Robert, Northumber-
land Fusiliers.
- Donelan**, Sec.-Lt. W. L., E. Kent
Regt.
- Donnelly**, Capt. James John, M.C.,
1 Newfoundland Regt.
- Donovan**, Lt. Patrick John, R.N.R.
- Doogan**, Sec.-Lt. G. W., R. Sussex
Regt.
- Doran**, Sec.-Lt. Louis G., R. Dublin
Fusiliers.
- d'Orleans and Braganza**, Capt.
Prince Antoine, M.C., A.D.C., R.
Can. Dgns.
- Dorrell**, Sec.-Lt. Evelyn P., 4
Queen's R. W. Surrey Regt.
- Downey**, Capt. William Edmund,
A.O.D.
- Downing**, Lt. Francis Geoffrey,
Middlesex Regt., attd. R.E.
- Doyle**, Sec.-Lt. Christopher Joseph,
R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Doyle**, Rev. Denis, S.J., C.F., attd.
2 Leinster Regt.
- Doyle**, Sec.-Lt. Henry, Tyneside
Irish, Northumbd. Fusiliers.
- Doyle**, Lt. John Joseph, 6 R. Dublin
Fusiliers.
- Doyle**, Lt. Francis H., Army Vet.
Corps.
- Doyle**, Rev. William J. Gabriel, S.J.,
M.C., C.F., attd. R. Dublin Fus.
- Drew**, Lt.-Comdr. Reginald Joseph
Blakeney, R.N.
- Drinkill**, Lt. Frederick Maurice, R.
Fusiliers.
- Drinkwater**, Lt. Edward Oscar,
R.A.F.
- Driscoll**, Lt. Dermot O'Neil, 15
Middlesex Regt.
- Druitt**, Sec.-Lt. Everard Joseph, 2
R. Berks Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Drummond**, Sec.-Lt. Robert Charles, Coldstream Guards.
- Duffy**, Lt. Desmond Gavan, A.I.F.
- Duffy**, Capt. Joseph, R.A.M.C.
- Duggan**, Lt. Thomas Alphonsus, E. Lancs Regt.
- Dugmore**, Lt.-Col. William Francis Brougham Radclyffe, D.S.O., N. Staffs Regt.
- du Moulin**, Lt.-Col. Francis Louis, M.C., 1 R. Sussex Regt.
- Duncan**, Lt. Philip C., London Regt.
- Dunderdale**, Sec.-Lt. W. H., Manchester Regt.
- Dundon**, Lt. J. St. John, M.B., R.A.M.C.
- Dunn**, Capt. John Valentine, 7 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Dunne**, Francis Xavier, Australian Machine Gun Co.
- Dupres**, Capt. E. C., R. Fusiliers.
- Durlacher**, Capt. Eric Alexander Ogilvie, M.C., Worcs. Regt.
- Dwyer**, Cpl. Edward, V.C., E. Surrey Regt.
- Dwyer**, Lt. Valentine Jameson.
- Eames**, Sec.-Lt. W. S., 12 R. Fus.
- Eardley-Wilmot**, Lt.-Col. Theodore, D.S.O., Suffolk Regt.
- Earle**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfred, 4 E. Yorks Regt.
- Earley**, Sec.-Lt. W., Middlesex Regt.
- East**, Capt. Hubert James, 1 York and Lancs Regt.
- Edward**, Lt. Bernard Joseph, Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
- Edwardes**, Major George D'Arcy, Dragoon Gds., attd. Welsh Regt.
- Edwardes**, Sec.-Lt. Henry Arthur, R.F.C.
- Edwards**, Sec.-Lt. E., Worcs Regt.
- Egerton**, Major Robert, M.C., R. Irish Fusiliers and R.F.C.
- Elliott**, Capt. Vere, R.F.A.
- Ellis**, Sec.-Lt. William Forrest, K.L.R.
- Ellison**, Sec.-Lt. Theodore Tarleton, Welsh Regt.
- Elmsley**, Lt. R. Basil, Can. Engrs.
- Elphick**, Sec.-Lt. Kevin, R. Irish Rifles.
- Emmet**, Robert, junr., Sec.-Lt., 1 Life Guards.
- Ennis**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Francis Xavier, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Ennis**, Capt. W. J., M.D., Can. A.M.C.
- Enright**, Sec.-Lt. T. G., R. Irish Rifles.
- Enright**, Capt. Thomas Louis, R.A.M.C.
- Esmonde**, Lt. Geoffrey Joseph, Tyneside Irish, Northumbd. Fus.
- Esmonde**, Midshipman John Henry Grattan, R.N.
- Eveleigh**, Lt.-Col. Edmund George, R.M.L.I., Nelson Bn., R.N.D.
- Ewen**, Capt. William James, 7 Bn., R.W. Kent Regt.
- Eyre**, Lt. Henry Joseph Bagshawe, Irish Guards.
- Eyre**, Vincent T. J., Cpl., Cheshire Regt.
- Fagan**, Sec.-Lt. James Edward, R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
- Fagan**, Lt. Jasper Gilbert, 119 Inf., I.A.
- Fairlie**, Capt. John Ogilvy, 10 Highland L.I.
- Fall**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Joseph, 15 Middlesex Regt.
- Fanning**, Capt. F., A.I.F.
- Farey**, Sec.-Lt. C.V., E. Surrey Regt.
- Farrell**, Lt. Adrian, E. Yorks Regt.
- Farrell**, Capt. Bede, 4 E. Yorks Regt.
- Farrell**, Sec.-Lt. John Leo, R. I. Rifles.
- Farren**, Lt. William Ignatius George, R. Welsh Fusiliers.
- Fattorini**, Lt. Thomas, R.A.F.
- Fazakerley-Westby**, Capt. Gilbert B. J., 9 London Regt.
- Fehilly**, Capt. Thomas J., R.A.M.C.
- Feilding**, Lt.-Comdr. the Hon. Hugh Cecil Robert, R.N.
- Feilding**, Capt. the Hon. Henry Peter, Coldstream Guards.
- Fendall**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Magrath, R.F.A.
- Fendall**, Lt. Denis, R.A.F.
- Fenn**, Capt. John Edmund, M.C., Liverpool Regt.
- Fenwick**, Capt. Anthony Lionel, Lincs Regt.
- Ferguson**, Lt. Aloysius J. Kinnier, British W. Indies Regt.
- Ferrers**, Lce.-Cpl. Francis C., Lancs Fusiliers.
- Ffield**, Flight-Sub-Lt. Bernard Osborne, R.N.A.S.
- Ffolliott**, Lt. Charles Russell Hastings, R.A.F.
- Fincham**, Temp. Flight-Comdr. and Capt. George Heygate, R.F.C.

A Roll of Honour

- Finegan**, Capt. Herbert Marion, 8 King's Liverpool Regt. (Liverpool Irish).
- Finigan**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid J., M.G.C.
- Finlay**, Capt. and Qmr. John C., Tyneside Irish (Northumberland Fusiliers).
- Finn**, Rev. William Joseph, C.F., attd. R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Fitzgerald**, Sec.-Lt. Gerald, Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Fitzgerald**, Lt. J. D., S. Lancs Regt.
- Fitzgibbon**, Capt. Michael Joseph, 7 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Fitzgibbon**, Rev. John, S.J., M.C., C.F.
- Fitzherbert-Brockholes**, Capt. and Adj. Thomas Joseph, 2 Rfl. Bde.
- Fitzpatrick**, Lt. Dudley T. F., 3 S. Staffs Regt.
- Fitzpatrick**, Capt. Gabriel Roy, 3 Welsh Regt.
- Fitzpatrick**, Sec.-Lt. J. J., R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Flanagan**, Lt. Joseph Samuel, London Regt.
- Flanigan**, Lt. Edmund Hughes, R.A.M.C.
- Fleming**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Joseph, Dorset Regt.
- Fletcher**, Sec.-Lt. Arthur Philip, R.E.
- Flinn**, Sec.-Lt. Philip W., 5 S. Lancs Regt. (T.F.).
- Flynn**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Michael, Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Fogarty**, Lt. Andrew Christopher, Australian Infantry.
- Fogarty**, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Joseph, R. Irish Regt., attd. R.F.C.
- Fogarty**, Capt. William Joseph, S. Irish Horse, attd. R. Irish Regt.
- Fogerty**, Lt. J. F. Cullinane, R.E.
- Fogg**, Lt. T. H.
- Foggin**, Sec.-Lt. G. W. D., R.A.F.
- Foley**, Victor S. Galwey, Pte., R. Innisk. Fusiliers.
- Foley**, Capt. J., Tyneside Irish Bde.
- Foley**, Capt. Michael James Aloysius, 10 Middlesex Regt. (T.F.).
- Foran**, Sec.-Lt. Edward Cornelius, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Forbes**, Capt. the Hon. Fergus George Arthur, 2 Bn., R.I.R.
- Forster**, William, R. Fusiliers.
- Forsyth**, Sec.-Lt. John C., Black Watch.
- Fothergill**, Lt. W. T., Durham L.I.
- Fottrell**, Lt. Brendan Joseph, 3 R. Irish Rifles.
- Fowler**, Christopher Richard, Pte., H.A.C.
- Fox**, George Alphonsus Grace, Sergt. Connaught Rangers.
- Fraser**, Major the Hon. Hugh Joseph, M.V.O., Scots Guards.
- Fraser**, Capt. T. F., 9 W. Yorks Regt.
- Freeman**, Surg. Gerald Stewart, R.N.
- Freeman**, Capt. Herbert J., A.S.C., attd. R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
- French**, Major Charles John, K. Shropshire L.I.
- French**, Sec.-Lt. Valentine Douglas, 5 Shropshire L.I.
- French**, Lt. the Hon. Ernest Aloysius, S. Wales Borderers.
- French**, Lt. the Hon. George Philip, 1 S. Wales Borderers.
- Fulcher**, Lt. Bernard V., M.C., S. Lancs Regt.
- Furlong**, Sec.-Lt. Philip James, King's Liverpool Regt.
- Gaffney**, F., Pte., Commercial Bn., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Gaisford**, Lt.-Col. Walter Thomas, Seaforth Highlanders.
- Gallagher**, Capt. William Augustine, 2 E. Lancs Regt.
- Gallagher**, Capt. Roland Henry, 7 E. Lancs Regt.
- Galton**, Lt. Francis William Joseph, Devon Regt.
- Galton**, Lt. Theodore Hugh, 6 Worcs Regt.
- Garritt**, Sec.-Lt. J. C., West Yorks Regt., attd. Durham L.I.
- Gaskell**, Capt. John Charles Temple, Indian Infantry.
- Gately**, Lt. John Edward, M.G.C.
- Geary**, Sec.-Lt. Ronald Fitzmaurice, London Regt.
- Gerard**, Capt. Gilbert Meade, Highland L.I.
- Gerrard**, Sec.-Lt. J. Maurice H., R.F.A.
- Gethin**, Sec.-Lt. Richard Patrick Wilmot, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Gibson**, Lt.-Col. Bertrand Dees, D.S.O., Cr. de Guerre avec Palme, Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Gill**, Lt. Edward W., R.F.A.
- Gill**, Lt. Noel B., Manchester Regt.
- Gilligan**, Sec.-Lt. John J., R.F.A.
- Giusani**, Sec.-Lt. St. John Joseph Vincent Antony, 10 R. Dublin Fu.

A Roll of Honour

- Gladwin**, Lt. Ralph Hamilton Fane, Scots Guards.
- Gleeson**, Capt. John Francis, M.C., D.C.M., 8 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Glynn**, Sec.-Lt. Matthew, Worcs Regt.
- Goddard**, Midshipman Gerald Denis Ambrose, R.N.
- Goddard**, Lt. Kenneth Mackenzie, Worcs Regt.
- Goldie**, Sec.-Lt. Paul, 1 Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
- Golding**, Capt. Thomas J., R.A.M.C.
- Goossens**, Sec.-Lt. Adolphe A., Lancs Regt.
- Gordon**, Rev. Michael, D.D., C.F.
- Gordon**, Brig.-Gen. Alistair Fraser, C.M.G., D.S.O., Gordon Hdrs.
- Gosling**, Lt. Gerald Noel, M.C., Gloucs Regt.
- Goss**, Lt. E. H. Allan, The Buffs.
- Gosselin**, Capt. Alwyn, D.S.O., Grenadier Guards.
- Gouldsbury**, Capt. Henry Cullen, R. Berks Regt., attd. K.R.A. Rif.
- Gradwell**, Sec.-Lt. George Francis, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Grattan-Bellew**, Major Willie, M.C., Conn. Rangers and R.F.C.
- Grech**, Sec.-Lt. Robert, R. Can. Highlanders.
- Greenwood**, Lt. John Francis Bernal, 1 K.O.R. Lancs Regt.
- Greig**, Major J. G., C.I.E., Bombay Pioneers.
- Greig**, Major Hugh Irwin, R.G.A.
- Griffin**, Capt. Charles John, R.W. Surrey Regt.
- Grisewood**, Capt. Geo. M. J. A., R. Sussex Regt.
- Grobel**, Rev. Peter, C.F.
- Guay**, Lt. Pierre Eugene, M.C., Can. Infantry.
- Gudgeon**, Lt. Athol E., R.N.R.
- Gudgeon**, Capt. Robert Eustace, M.C., R.F.A., attd. T.M. Bty.
- Gunnis**, Sec.-Lt. Ian, 2 Bn. Grenadier Guards.
- Gurkin**, Sec.-Lt. Reginald Wells, E. Surrey Regt.
- Guthrie**, Rev. Dom. David M., O.S.B., C.F.
- Gwydir**, Canon Robert Basil, O.S.B., Acting Naval Chaplain.
- Gwyn**, Sec.-Lt. Reginald Augustine Jermy, Lincs Regt.
- Gwynn**, Rev. John, S.J., C.F., attd. 1 Irish Guards.
- Hackett**, Lt. Walter Ralph, R.W. Kent Regt.
- Haggarty**, Sec.-Lt. John Joseph, Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Halahan**, Capt. Henry Crossley, D.S.O., R.N.
- Hall**, Lt. George Ferrier Mansfield, 1 R. Berks Regt.
- Hall**, Sec.-Lt. J. Ramsay, 3 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Hall**, Lt. Louis Sylvester, R.E.
- Halligan**, Lt. Matthew, R.F.C.
- Hamilton**, Capt. Henry Edward Redmond, Can. Rlwy. Troops.
- Hamilton**, Lt. Roy, R. Irish Rifles.
- Hanly**, Lt. John Malby Bergin, R.N.
- Harding**, Capt. Francis Edward Basil, R.F.A.
- Harding**, Capt. James Golding, R.F.A.
- Harding**, Capt. James P., R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Hardy**, Lt. Ferdinand H., R. Fus., attd. M.G.C.
- Harold**, Midshipman Geoffrey Charles, R.N.
- Harold**, Lt. John P. Bevan, R.F.A., attd. R.F.C.
- Harold-Barry**, Sec.-Lt. J. Gerald, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Harold-Barry**, Capt. John, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Harrington**, Lt. Charles Stanley, Connaught Rangers.
- Harris**, Capt. P. D., 1 N. Staffs Regt.
- Harrison**, Major Cecil Eustace, 2 Rifle Bde.
- Harte**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph F., R. Scots.
- Harter**, Major John George, Durham L.I.
- Hartigan**, Rev. J. Austin, S.J., attd. Connaught Rangers.
- Hartley**, Lt. D'Arcy John Joseph, Dragoon Guards attd. M.G.C.
- Hartnoll**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Peter, Worcs Regt.
- Harty**, Sec.-Lt. John Joseph, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Harty**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid A., R.D.F.
- Harvey**, Lt. Harry Thomas, M.G.C.
- Harvey**, Sec.-Lt. John Albert, R.W. Surrey Regt., attd. T.M.B.
- Harvie**, Lt. P. J., Northmbd. Fus.
- Hasler**, Lt. Algernon, Gren. Gds.
- Hasslacher**, Lt. James Alfred Charles, London Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Hastings**, Sec.-Lt. Aubrey Joseph, 7 E. Surrey Regt.
Hastings, Capt. Noel H. B., Glos Regt.
Hatch, Sec.-Lt. Norman Claud, S. Lancs Regt.
Hawkins, Major Alexander Edward, R.F.A.
Hawkswell, Lt. L. Bertram W., W. Yorks Regt. and R.A.F.
Hay, Sec.-Lt. Frank Tochetti, 7 R. Scots Fusiliers.
Hay, Willie, 7 British Columbia Regt.
Hayden, Sec.-Lt. Leo A., R. Irish Regt.
Hayes, Capt. Claude Julian Patrick, R. Fusiliers.
Hayes, Lt. Lea John, King's Liverpool Regt.
Hayes, Capt. William, D.S.O., R. West Surrey Regt.
Hayes-Newington, Capt. Charles Wetherall, Cheshire Regt.
Hayes-Newington, Lt. Harold May, 1 King's Liverpool Regt.
Healy, Sec.-Lt. Dermot J., R. Munster Fusiliers, att'd. T.M.B.
Healy, Sec.-Lt. Edward, Border Regt.
Healy, Lt. Michael, A.I.F.
Healy, Lt. William Patrick, M.C., Australian Infantry.
Hecht, Capt. Marcus Francis, K.R.R.C.
Heenan, Capt. Michael Cornelius, 1 Leinster Regt.
Heffernan, Lt.-Col. Francis Joseph Christopher, F.R.C.S.I., R.A.M.C.
Heffernan, Sec.-Lt. William, R.F.C.
Heffernan, Sec.-Lt. William Patrick, 3 R. Irish Regt.
Hegarty, Lt. Andrew, R.A.M.C.
Hegarty, Capt. Edward, M.C., R. Irish Regt.
Hemelryk, Sec.-Lt. Eugene John Vincent, Lancs Fusiliers.
Henderson, Lt. Stanislaus Robert, Gordon Highlanders.
Henn, Sec.-Lt. Edward Eric Lovett, 9 K.R.R.C.
Henna, Lt. J. R., R. Irish Regt.
Henry, Sec.-Lt. Dermot J., R. Irish Fusiliers.
Henry, Lt. John Aloysius Gerard, R.A.F.
Henry, Noel, Pte., 7 Seaforth Highlanders.
Herbert, Capt. the Hon. Elidyr John Bernard, Yeomanry and M.G.C.
Herrick, Capt. Harry Eustace, R. Irish Fusiliers.
Heveningham, Sec.-Lt. Lionel J., R.F.A.
Hewett, Capt. Henry Walter O'Connell, Indian Army.
Hewett, Sec.-Lt. Stephen Henry P., R. Warwickshire Regt.
Hewison, Sec.-Lt. Geoffrey J., 3 R. Munster Fusiliers.
Heyes, Sec.-Lt. Austin, M.C., R.A.F.
Hickey, Sec.-Lt. A. A., Lancs Fus.
Hickey, Sec.-Lt. Robert Francis, Dublin Fusiliers.
Higgins, Lt. Michael Aloysius, Leinster Regt.
Hill, Major F. J. C., 6 (serv.) York and Lancaster Regt.
Hill, Flight-Comdr. H. O., R.F.C.
Hillier, Sec.-Lt. Maurice H., K.O.S.B.
Hines, Sec.-Lt. Austin, 10 Durham L.I.
Hines, Major Charles William, 7 Durham L.I.
Hingston, Lt. Reginald Basil, 24 Canadian Bn.
Hinsley, Lt. Wilfrid, R.A.F.
Hoade, Sec.-Lt. Reginald W., Middlesex Regt.
Hobdell, Sec.-Lt. A. B., Wilts Regt.
Hodgkinson, Capt. John Francis, 3 Dragoon Guards.
Hodgkinson, Lt. Samuel Charles Lindsey, R. Australian Navy.
Hodgson, Lt. Joseph, R.E.
Hoey, Sec.-Lt. Frederick Cyril, R.F.C.
Hogan, Lt. Robert Garret Roche, Beds Regt.
Holden, Lt. Joseph Roger, R.E.
Holland, Leo, A/Co. Sergt.-Major, 10 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Holms, Capt. John Cyril, 9 London Regt (T.).
Holton, Sec.-Lt. Charles Fifield, N. Staffs Regt.
Honan, Capt. Matthew Burke, South Lancs Regt.
Hook, Capt. Cyril Walter Kennan, Manchester Regt.
Hook, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Francis, 8 Border Regt.
Hope, Lt. William Edward, Irish Guards.

A Roll of Honour

- Horan**, Lt. Charles Robert, M.C.,
R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Horsford**, Lt. Thomas Gavin Moor,
2 Beds Regt.
- Houlihan**, Capt. J. V., A.I.F.
- Howard**, Lt. the Hon. Philip Gran-
ville Fitzalan, Welsh Guards.
- Howard**, Sec.-Lt. William Aloysius,
K.O.S.B.
- Howarth**, Sec.-Lt. Gerald, R.A.
- Howe**, Lt. John, 14 Canadian Inf.
- Howell**, Lt. Charles Joseph, York
and Lancaster Regt.
- Howie**, Lt. George F., Royal Scots.
- Howley**, Major Jasper Joseph,
D.S.O., Lincs Regt.
- Hoynes-Fox**, Lt. Leslie Vincent,
Indian Army.
- Huddleston**, Lt. Maurice Louis,
Durham L.I.
- Hughes**, Capt. Bryan Desmond,
M.C., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Hughes**, Capt. Christopher James,
Connaught Rangers.
- Hughes**, Capt. Roger Forrest, B.A.,
M.B., Ch.M., 1 Australian F. Amb.
- Humble**, Engr.-Lt. Edward W. G.,
R.N.R.
- Hume-Wright**, Lt. Maurice Gabriel,
8 Yorks Regt.
- Hunter**, Capt. Thomas Vicars, Rifle
Bde. and R.F.C.
- Huntingdon**, Lt. Nigel Jocelyn,
2 Lincoln Regt.
- Hussey**, Edward Wilfred, London
Regt.
- Hussey**, Henry, Canadian Infantry.
- Hussey**, Philip James, Queen's
Westminster Rifles.
- Hes**, Lt. John Francis, R.F.A.
- Ingham**, Sec.-Lt. Claude M., Conn.
Rangers.
- Irvine**, Lt. Charles Wallace, R.
Inniskg. Fus.
- Jarrett**, Major Charles Henry
Brownlow, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Jarrett**, Capt. Aylmer Vivian, D.S.O.
York and Lancaster Regt.
- Jenings**, Lt. George Creagh, 1
Shropshire L.I.
- Jennings**, Sec.-Lt. Harold William,
R.F.A.
- Jennings**, Cpl. Edgar McIvor,
Wellington Bn., N.Z.I.F.
- Johnson**, Sec.-Lt. Hubert Alfred
R.F.C.
- Johnston**, Brig.-Gen. Francis Earl,
C.B., N. Staffs Regt.
- Johnston**, Capt. O. Ralph F., 4
Middlesex Regt.
- Jones**, Sec.-Lt. C. N. Hamilton,
Middlesex Regt., att'd. Liverpool
Regt.
- Jones**, David, V.C., Sergt., King's
Liverpool Regt.
- Jones**, Sec.-Lt. Francis J., R.A.F.
- Jones**, Sec.-Lt. John James, R.A.F.
- Jones**, Lt. H. M., King's Liverpool
Regt.
- Jones**, Major John Langdale,
R.A.M.C.
- Joslin**, Major Francis John, R. W.
Kent Regt.
- Joyce**, Sec.-Lt. James, 9 Lancs
Fusiliers.
- Kane**, Capt. John Francis Aloysius,
2 Devonshire Regt., Sqdn.-Cmdr.
R.F.C.
- Kane**, Sergt. Robert Henry, R.
Fusiliers.
- Kane**, Col. Robert Romney, D.S.O.
and Bar, 1 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Kavanagh**, Rev. Bernard, C.S.S.R.,
C.F.
- Kavanagh**, Lt. Thomas O. J., R. Irish
Fusiliers.
- Kay**, Sec.-Lt. Roland, Durham L.I.
- Kean**, Lt. Cuthbert B., R.N.R.
- Kearney**, Lt. Arthur Joseph, att'd.
2 Munster Fusiliers.
- Keating**, Lt. David Timothy, York
and Lancaster Regt.
- Keating**, Capt. Richard P., 8 Liver-
pool Regt. (Liverpool Irish).
- Keating**, Capt. T. Joseph, R.F.A.
- Keepfer**, Lt. William Robert Cyril,
2 R. Welsh Fusiliers.
- Kelleher**, Lt. Bertie, A.S.C., att'd.
K.O.R. Lancaster Regt.
- Kelly**, Alexander.
- Kelly**, Lt. Charles Edward Patrick,
B.A., M.B., R.A.M.C.
- Kelly**, Cecil Godfrey, Gnr., R.F.A.
- Kelly**, Lt.-Col. George Henry Fitz-
maurice, comdg. 34 Sikh Pioneers.
- Kelly**, Capt. John J., Leinster Regt.
- Kelly**, Sec.-Lt. Oscar Raphael,
Northumbd. Fusiliers and R.F.C.
- Kelly**, Capt. Thomas Aloysius, M.C.,
London Regt.
- Kelly**, Capt. William Peter, Tyne-
side Irish, Northumbd. Fusiliers.
- Kenealey**, Lce.-Cpl. William, V.C.,
1 Lancs Fusiliers.
- Kenna**, Brig.-Gen. Paul Aloysius,
V.C., D.S.O.

A Roll of Honour

- Kennedy**, Lt. James Joseph, R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
- Kennedy**, Sec.-Lt. J. P. D., London Irish, attd. M.G.C.
- Kennefick**, Capt. Edward H., 3 (attd. 2) Essex Regt.
- Kennefick**, Capt. John G. H., Essex Regt.
- Kenny**, Sub-Lt. Bernard William, R.N.V.R.
- Kenny**, Sec.-Lt. Cecil Stacpoole, 9 Bn. Shropshire L.I.
- Kenny**, Sec.-Lt. F. J. L., Connaught Rangers, attd. R. Inniskg. Fus.
- Kenny**, Lt. John Mary Joseph, R.F.C.
- Keogh**, Lt. William Gerald, Leinster Regt., attd. Northumbd. Fus.
- Kerr**, Sec.-Lt. David Anselm, R. Scots.
- Kettle**, Lt. Thomas Michael, Leinster Regt., attd. R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Kilkelly**, Major Edward, M.C., R.F.A.
- Kilkelly**, Capt. John George Joseph, 1 R. Munster Fus., attd. R.F.C.
- King**, Engr.-Lt.-Comdr. Patrick John, R.N.
- King**, Capt. T. S., E. Surrey Regt.
- Kirke**, Major Errol Wharton, A.I.F.
- Kirkwood**, Lt. W., K.O.S.B.
- Knapp**, Rev. Simon Stock, O.D.C., D.S.O., M.C., C.F., attd. Irish Guards.
- Knatchbull-Hugessen**, Sec.-Lt. Maurice Astley, Grenadier Gds.
- Knight-Roche**, Sec.-Lt. Edmund Joseph, Leinster Regt.
- Koe**, Sec.-Lt. Philip Stephen, York and Lancaster Regt.
- Kurten**, Sec.-Lt. Gaston P., R.G.A.
- Kynaston**, Lt. John Oswald Maurice, M.G.C.
- Lacy**, Lt. T. J., R.F.A.
- Lalor**, Capt. Joseph Patrick, 12 Australian Regt.
- Lamb**, Capt. Everard J., 3 Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Lamb**, Sec.-Lt. Francis C., R.F.C.
- Lancaster**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Clement, K.O.R. Lancaster Regt.
- Lane**, Sec.-Lt. John Boyd Armstrong, 6 R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Langdale**, Lt. Edward Stourton, R.E.
- Lashford**, Sec.-Lt. Vincent Clarke, R.A.F., Canadian Section.
- Lattley**, Major James Cumming, R.F.A., attd. R.G.A.
- Laughton**, Lt. Hubert Henry Schomberg, 2 Worcs Regt.
- Lavella**, Sec.-Lt. James D., 12 Highland L.I.
- Lavelle**, Capt. Patrick Aloysius, R. Scots Fusiliers and T.M. Bty.
- Law**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Pakenham, 2 Irish Guards.
- Lawder**, Major Noel Wilfrid, Beds Regt.
- Lawless**, Sec.-Lt. Barry J. A., 2 London Regt. and T.M. Bty.
- Lawlor**, Sec.-Lt. E. F., Monmouthshire Regt. (T.).
- Lawlor**, Midshipman J., R.N.R.
- Lawrence**, Lt. Guy Francis, Grenadier Guards.
- Leahy**, Capt. Eugene Patrick, M.B., R.A.M.C.
- Leahy**, Lt. Noel Edward Carroll- "Rocket Troop," R.H.A.
- Leake**, Capt. George Dalton, E. Lancs Regt.
- Leake**, Lt. Eric Larking Wheedon, 1 Lancs Fusiliers.
- Le Brasseur**, Lt. Robin H. H., R.F.C.
- Lee**, Sec.-Lt. William Robert Charles Paul, R. Fusiliers.
- Leeson**, Rev. James, C.F.
- Lefebvre**, Capt. R. H., 22 Quebec Regt. and R.A.F.
- Leger**, Lt. Aine Antoine, R.F.C.
- Leighton**, Lt. Roland Aubrey, 7 Worcs Regt.
- Lemass**, Sec.-Lt. Herbert Justin, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Lemieux**, Lt. L. Rodolphe, Quebec Regt.
- Lenahan**, Lt. Robert Eric, 1 Field Art. Bde., A.I.F.
- Lennon**, Lt. John Alphonsus, Australian Imperial Force.
- Lentaigne**, Sec.-Lt. Victor Aloysius, Connaught Rangers.
- Leteux**, Gnr. F., Canadian M.G.C.
- Liddell**, Capt. John Aiden, V.C., 3 Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders and R.F.C.
- Liebert**, Capt. Frederick Alexander Charles, N. Som. Yeom. (late 3 Dragoon Guards).
- Light**, Sec.-Lt. J. G.
- Lillis**, Lt. Martin Arthur, R. Irish Regt., attd. R.F.C.
- Lindrea**, Major G. Patrick, R.F.A.
- Liston**, Capt. William Prosper St. L., 5 Leinster Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Littledale**, Major Arthur Charles, R.F.A.
Littledale, Capt. Robert, Northamptonshire Regt.
Littlewood, Sec.-Lt. Charles William Stephen, M.C., R.E.
Lloyd, Capt. William Henry Aloysius, 101 Grenadiers, I.A.
Lochrin, Capt. Michael J., R.A.M.C.
Lockley, Sec.-Lt. H. J., Lancs Fus.
Lomax, Lt. William. R. Scots Fusiliers.
Long, Lt. Francis William, R.F.A.
Looby, Rev. Patrick, C.F.
Lord, Sec.-Lt. Eustace Charles Gabriel, Irish Guards.
Lord-Flood, Surgeon-Probationer James J. A.
Luby, Sec.-Lt. Thomas William Cox, Worcs Regt.
Lucas, Sec.-Lt. Perceval Drewett, Border Regt.
Lumsden, Major Carlos Barron, 18 (4 Glasgow) Highland L.I.
Lund, Lt. W., A.S.C.
Lunt, Sec.-Lt. Christopher, Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
Lynch, Lt. and Adj. Bartholomew P., Rifle Bde.
Lynch, Sec.-Lt. Denis, W. Yorks Regt.
Lynch, Sec.-Lt. Francis William, 4 Connaught Rangers.
Lynch, Sec.-Lt. Harold Francis, 1 R. Welsh Fusiliers.
Lynch, Capt. Joseph Edward, 10 Yorks Regt.
Lynch, Sec.-Lt. James M., R. Scots.
Lynch, Capt. Patrick Stephen, M.C., 7 Leinster Regt.
Lynch, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid John Massey-, Dragoon Guards.
Lynch-Staunton, Sec.-Lt. Geoffrey, 13 Hussars.
Lyons, Sec.-Lt. R. A., 10 Hussars.
Lyons, Sec.-Lt. Vincent Aloysius, M.A., H.L.I.
McAdam, Lt. Arthur Charles, R.M.L.I.
McAlevey, Capt. William Francis, R.A.M.C.
McArdle, Lt. Hugh, King Edward's Horse and R.F.C.
Macardle, Sec.-Lt. Kenneth Callan, 17 Manchester Regt.
McArdle, Sec.-Lt. Peter Paul, Cheshire Regt., attd. York and Lancaster Regt.
McAuliffe, Rev. Fr. Raphael, O.F.M., C.F.
McBrien, Sec.-Lt. Hubert John, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
McCallion, Capt. Frank Mungo, M.C., Seaforth Highlanders.
McCarthy, Lt. John C. T., Connaught Rangers, attd. No. 1 T.M. Bty.
McCarthy-O'Leary, Lt. William Felix, R. Munster Fusiliers.
McCartin, Lt. Leo Aloysius, M.C., Australian Infantry.
McClorry, Lt. J. B., R.N.R.
McClure, Lt. Thomas Albert, R.A.F.
McCormack, Sec.-Lt. Edward, 5 Gordon Highlanders.
McCormack, Capt. John F., Sherwood Foresters.
McCormack, Capt. John J., Tyne-side Irish, Northumbd. Fusiliers.
McCourt, Sec.-Lt. Cyril Douglas, London Regt.
McCudden, Major James Thomas Byford, V.C., D.S.O., and Bar M.C. and Bar, R.A.F.
McCudden, Sec.-Lt. J. Anthony, M.C., R.A.F.
McCudden, Flight-Sergt. W. T. J., R.F.C.
McCurrach, Sub-Lt. William, R.N.D.
McCusker, Lt. Patrick Joseph, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
McDermot, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Maurice, 6 R. Irish Fusiliers.
McDermott, Sec.-Lt. Edward, M.C., attd. E. Yorks R.
McDonagh, Sec.-Lt. Patrick, R. W. Kent Regt.
Macdonald, Lt. Donald R., R.N.
McDonald, Lt. G. Fraser, 77 Can. Infantry.
McDonald, Capt. Sylvester Patrick, M.C., D.C.M., Worcs Regt.
McDonnell, Lt. Charles Edward, 12 Middlesex Regt.
MacDonnell, Major Francis William Joseph, W. Yorks Regt.
MacDonnell, Rev. John, C.M., C.F.
MacDonnell, Lt. John Hy. O'Connell de Courcy, Con. Rangers, attd. 2 Leinster Regt.
McEnery, Capt. John Aloysius, R.E.
MacGarry, Sec.-Lt. William Frederick Cecil, 6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
McGee, Capt. Charles E., 7 Bn Can. Infantry.
McGee, Lt. Frank C. L., 21 Can. Infantry.

A Roll of Honour

- McGeorge**, Sec.-Lt. T. Leslie, 5 Manchester Regt.
- McGhee**, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Aloysius, Cameron Highlanders.
- McGinity**, Rev. Henry Cuthbert, S.J., C.F.
- McGivney**, Lt. Philip, D.S.O., Lancs Fusiliers.
- McGovern**, Capt. Arthur L., 28 Canadian Infantry.
- McGrane**, Sec.-Lt. Peter Leo. R. Irish Regt., attd. R. Inniskg. Fus.
- McGrath**, Capt. J. J., A.I.F.
- McGrath**, Lt. Noel George Scott, 2 Dragoon Guards.
- McGrory**, Lt. John Joseph, Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders (I.).
- McGuinness**, Lt. James Stewart, Northumberland Fusiliers.
- McGuire**, Lt. Edward, 11 Highland L.I.
- MacHale**, Lt. John Richard Jarlath, King's Liverpool Regt.
- McIlvaine**, Rev. John, C.F., H.M. Hospital ship *Glenart Castle*.
- McIntosh**, Sec.-Lt. William A., Royal Scots.
- McIntyre**, Sec.-Lt. Francis, E. Yorks Regt.
- McIver**, Hugh, V.C., M.M. and Bar, Pte., R. Scots.
- McKeever**, Lt. James H., Cheshire Regt.
- McKeever**, Capt. Louis Lawrence, M.C., R.A.M.C.
- McKenna**, Capt. Arthur L., 28 Canadian Infantry.
- McKenna**, Capt. E. A., Australian Infantry, A.N.Z.A.C.
- Mackenzie**, Lt. Ronald Angus Hugh, 1 Leinster Regt.
- McKey**, Sec.-Lt. Aloysius Hugh, Highland L.I.
- McKiernan**, Sec.-Lt. Michael, Conn. Rangers.
- McKinty**, Lt., R.N.R.
- MacLachlan**, Sec.-Lt. Ninian P., N.Z.E.F.
- McLaughlin**, Lt. Edmund Coldicoate, 6 City of London Regt. (T.)
- McLaughlin**, Lt. James P., 4 R. Dublin Fus., attd. 2 R. Irish Regt.
- McLean**, Sub-Lt. Archibald, R.N.R.
- McMahon**, Sec.-Lt. Charles, 1 Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
- McManus**, Lt. Terence Joseph, 2 Middlesex Regt.
- McMenamin**, Rev. James J., Major and C.F., N.Z. Force.
- Macmullen**, Cecil Fothergill, N.Z.P.S.
- McNally**, Surg. Hugh Francis de Sales, R.N.
- Macnamara**, Lt. Arthur William, D.F.C., R.A.F.
- McNamara**, Sec.-Lt. George Frederick, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- MacNamara**, Lt. Vincent, R.E.
- McNulty**, Lt. Michael, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Macpherson**, Lt. John Symon, Gordon Highlanders.
- McShane**, Sec.-Lt. John C., R.E.
- McShane**, Lt. Vincent C., 15 Northumbd. Fus., attd. 2 S. Wales Bdrs.
- McSharry**, Lt.-Col. Terence Patrick, C.M.G., D.S.O., and Bar M.C., A.I.F.
- McSherry**, Lt. Bernard, Manchester Regt.
- MacSherry**, Sec.-Lt. Dermot Joseph, Connaught Rangers.
- McSweeney**, Lt. Randal Roderick, Highland L.I.
- MacSwiney**, Brisco Francis, Pte., 10 (Scottish) King's Liverpool Regt.
- MacSwiney**, Denis Quin.
- MacSwiney**, Felix Desmond, Can. Infantry.
- MacSwiney**, Capt. Joseph Ray, M.C., Liverpool Regt.
- MacSwiney**, Sec.-Lt. Claude O'Connell, King's Shropshire L.I.
- McVeigh**, Lt. William John, R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Madeley**, Sec.-Lt. Claude Neville, R.A.F.
- Magrane**, Sec.-Lt. George Fairfield, R.G.A.
- Maguire**, Capt. Francis, 2 Bn. Can. Infantry.
- Maguire**, Sec.-Lt. Francis Patrick, Leinster Regt.
- Maguire**, Sec.-Lt. Henry, R.E.
- Maguire**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh, Connaught Rangers, attd. 7 Inniskg. Fusiliers.
- Maguire**, Lt. John Timothy, M.C., Australian Infantry.
- Maguire**, Lt. Matthew Lawrence, M.C., Conn. Rangers and R.F.C.
- Maher**, Lt. John Charles, Irish Guards.
- Mahon**, Asst.-Paymaster Patrick Singleton, R.N.R.
- Mahony**, Lt. Edward A., R. Irish Rifles.

A Roll of Honour

- Mahony**, Lt. Edmund Joseph, 1 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Mahony**, Lt. James, R. W. Surrey Regt.
- Mahony**, Capt. and Qmr. Thomas B., M.C., R. Irish Regt.
- Maitland**, Capt. Keith Ramsay Andrew, M.C. and Bar, R.F.A.
- Makinson**, Sec.-Lt. F. V., King's Liverpool Regt.
- Mallen**, Lt. William, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Mallins**, Sec.-Lt. Claude Joseph O'Connor, Connaught Rangers.
- Malone**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph J., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Malone**, Lt.-Col. W. G., N.Z. Inf.
- Mauby-Colegrave**, Lt. Gerard Thomas, A.S.C., attd. R.G.A.
- Mankelow**, Lt. Archibald Henry, M.C., 39 Gharwel Rifles.
- Mann**, Flight-Lt. Alfred, R.N.A.S.
- Mapplebeck**, Capt. Gilbert William Roger, D.S.O., A/Flight-Comdr. R.F.C.
- Markes**, Major John Carlon, Leinster Regt.
- Marshall**, Lt. John Woodall, M.C., 27 (Tyneside Irish) Northmbd. Fusiliers.
- Martin**, Lt. Charles Andrew, 6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Martin**, Brig.-Gen. Cuthbert Thomas, D.S.O. and Bar, Highland L.I.
- Martin**, Lt. Eldred Joseph, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Martin**, Lt. Gerald Patrick, 8 Northumberland Fusiliers.
- Martin**, Capt. and Adj. Marcel James, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Massey-Lynch**, Lt. Wilfrid John, Dragoon Guards.
- Mathew**, Capt. George Dudley, 2 Gurkhas.
- Mathews**, Sec.-Lt. James Henry, R. Berks Regt.
- Matthews**, Rev. Lewis Joseph, C.F., 1 cl.
- Maude**, Sec.-Lt. Robert Henry Ernest, 3 N. Staffs Regt.
- Maunsell**, Capt. Thomas Bowyer Lane, 1 Lancs Fusiliers.
- Maunsell**, Capt. and Adj. Wilfrid Innocent, 2 Cameronians.
- Mawdsley**, Sec.-Lt. John Edmund, K.O.R. Lancaster Regt.
- Maxwell-Stuart**, Lt. Edmund Joseph R.E.
- Maxwell-Stuart**, Sec.-Lt. Henry Joseph Ignatius, Coldstream Guards.
- Maxwell-Stuart**, Lt. Joseph Joachim 9 W. Riding Regt.
- Meade**, Capt. Michael Joseph, M.C., Liverpool Regt.
- Meager**, Sec.-Lt. Hubert R. W., 3 Australian Infantry.
- Merewether**, Capt. John Alworth, Rifle Bde.
- Meyer**, Sec.-Lt. Constant C. W., Lincs Regt.
- Meynell**, Capt. E. J. Hugh, S. Staffs Regt.
- Meynell**, Sec.-Lt. Hugo Charles, 11 Essex Regt.
- Miers**, Capt. Douglas N. C. Capel, Cameron Highlanders.
- Miers**, Lt.-Col. Maurice Colin Capel, Middlesex Regt., attd. Som. L.I.
- Millar**, Lt. Ian, M.G.C.
- Miller**, Lt. Frederick William Joseph Macdonald, Grenadier Guards.
- Molony**, Lt. Charles Albert, Liverpool Regt.
- Molloy**, Capt. Bryan Charles Baskerville, Q.O. Oxfordshire Hussars.
- Molyneux-Seel**, Capt. Louis E. H., Border Regt.
- Monie**, Lt. Bruce, A.I.F.
- Monie**, Lt. Roy, R.F.A.
- Monk**, Capt. Gerald Patrick de Baillon, 1 Welsh Regt.
- Monks**, Lt.-Engr. Frederick, R.N.
- Montagu**, Lt. Alexander Cyril, R.N.
- Montagu**, Rev. Walter Philip, S.J., C.F.
- Monteith**, Capt. George, Gordon Highlanders.
- Monteith**, Major Henry, 1 Lanarks. Yeomanry.
- Monteith**, Rev. Robert John, S.J., C.F.
- Mooney**, Sec.-Lt. F. R., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Moorat**, Antony, Queen's Westminster.
- Moorat**, Bernard Joseph Cyril, Lce.-Cpl., H.A.C.
- Moorat**, Capt. Francis Ferrers, Middlesex Regt.
- Moore**, Sec.-Lt. Gillachrist, R. Sussex Regt.
- Moore**, Lt. James J., Canadian Inf.
- Moore**, Lt. James George, R.A.F.
- Moore**, Capt. Stuart, D.S.O., M.C., Canadian Inf.

A Roll of Honour

- Moore**, Lt. Ulick A., Conn. Rangers.
Moorhead, Bt.-Col. Arthur Henry, I.M.S.
Moran, Lt. Herbert James, 8 Gurkhas.
Morgan, Lt. Richard, R.N.R.
Moriarty, Sec.-Lt. Denis J., R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
Morison, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Patrick John, 1 Cameron Highlanders.
Morrall, Capt. (A/Major) Edgar Percy Basil, Border Regt.
Morrall, Lt. J. Bernard, R. Warwickshire Regt.
Morris, Lt.-Comdr. Charles Sebastian, R.N.
Morris, Lt.-Col. the Hon. George Henry, comdg. 1 Irish Guards.
Morris, Michael F. S., Leinster Regt.
Morriss, Sec.-Lt. Jack Septimus, R. Warwickshire Regt.
Morrogh, Sec.-Lt. Francis Matthew Dominick, 4 R. Munster Fusiliers.
Morrogh, Capt. Henry Edward, R. Irish Fusiliers.
Morrogh-Bernard, Lt. Francis Antony, 3 R. Munster Fusiliers.
Motler, Sec.-Lt. John Frederick Manchester Regt.
Mullaby, Capt. Brian Desmond, Tyneside Irish, Northmbd. Fus., attd. Munsters.
Mullins, Sec.-Lt. James Brendan Lane, R.F.A.
Mulroy, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Bernard, King's Liverpool Regt.
Munster, Lt. John Francis, Hussars.
Murphy, Sec.-Lt. Albert, Northumberland Fusiliers.
Murphy, Major (T/Lt.-Col.) Alfred Durham, D.S.O., M.C., Leinster Regt.
Murphy, Sec.-Lt. Christopher John, 3 R. Munster Fusiliers.
Murphy, Capt. Edwin Hale, 2 Leinster Regt.
Murphy, Capt. Francis Joseph Patrick, 17 Bn. (N.S.W.) Inf., A.I.F.
Murphy, Sec.-Lt. George, R. Warwick Regt., attd. Lancs Fus.
Murphy, Capt. Harry Eustace, R. Fusiliers and R.A.F.
Murphy, Capt. Lewis William, D.C.L.I., attd. Wilts Regt.
Murphy, Lt. Michael Joseph, Worcs Regt.
Murphy, Capt. W. J., R. Dublin Fus.
Murray, Capt. Patrick Austin, 25 (Tyneside Irish) Northmbd. Fus.
Murray, Capt. William Edward, 1 Gordon Highlanders.
Nadaud, Major Henry L. F. B., London Regt.
Nagle, Capt. Gilbert, M.C., R. Sussex Regt.
Narey, Sec.-Lt. Vincent Gerald, W. Riding Regt.
Nash, Lt. James Haran, Irish Guards.
Neeley, Lce.-Sergt. Thomas, V.C., R. Lancaster Regt.
Neeley, Sec.-Lt. Clive William, R. Fus., attd. Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
Neely, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Bertram, 1 Suffolk Regt.
Neilan, Lt. Gerald Aloysius, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Nesbitt, Sec.-Lt. William Charles, 6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Neville, Capt. Bernard Philip, 7 Lincs Regt.
Neville, Lt. Hugh George, S. Wales Borderers.
Nevill, Sec.-Lt. John Henry Gathorne, 2 Grenadier Guards.
Newbery, Asst.-Paymaster Bernard C.C., R.N.R.
Newman, Sec.-Lt. Cecil H., R. West Surrey Regt.
Nicholson, Major Edward Francis Dale, S. Lancs Regt.
Nicholson, Sec.-Lt. Paul Chessum, 9 K.O. Yorks L.I.
Nicolai, Lt. Renato Claude, 1 Warwick Regt.
Noel, Capt. the Hon. Robert, R. Fusiliers, attd. Nigerian Regt.
Nolan, Sec.-Lt. Jack, M.C., D.C.M., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Nolan, Surg.-Probationer James J., R.N.V.R.
Nolan, Sec.-Lt. Maurice E., R.E.
Nolan, Sec.-Lt. Maurice H. W., R. Irish Regt., attd. R. Irish Rifles and 10 Trench Mortar Bty.
Nolan, Lt. Raymund Philip Drummond, 3 Black Watch.
Nolan, Capt. Rupert Henry, R.A.M.C.
Norris, Lt.-Col. Ignatius Bertram, Australian Infantry.
Nugent, Sec.-Lt. John Aloysius Joseph, Leinster Regt.
Nugent, Asst.-Paymaster Mark Lavallan O'Reilly, R.N.

A Roll of Honour

- Nugent, Sec.-Lt. Richard Francis**
Robert, Scots Guards.
- Nugent, Capt. the Hon. William A.,**
15 Hussars.
- Oates, Sec.-Lt. Herbert Prudent, 5**
King's Liverpool Regt.
- O'Beirne, Lt. Arthur James L.,**
Oxfordshire Yeom. and R.F.C.
- Oberhoffer, George, Pte., 18 R. Fus.,**
Public Schools Bn.
- O'Brien, Capt. Augustine, 1 New-**
foundland Regt.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Daniel Joseph, R.**
Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Brien, Capt. Francis J., Worcs.**
Regt.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Francis Patrick,**
E. Surrey Regt.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Gerald, D.S.O.,**
R. Munster Fus., attd. Inniskg.
- O'Brien, Capt. Hugh Conor Henry,**
R. Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Brien, Capt. Hugh Rivers Hamil-**
ton, E.R.F.A.
- O'Brien, Lt. James Francis, R.**
Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Brien, Capt. Jeremiah J., R.**
Irish Regt.
- O'Brien, Capt. John, M.C., R.M.F.**
- O'Brien, Lt. John Dwyer, M.C., R.**
Munster Fus., attd. R.I. Rifles.
- O'Brien, Capt. J. Vincent, R.A.M.C.,**
attd. 5 Bde., R.F.A., Lahore
Division.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Lucius J. F.,**
Wilts Regt.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Sidney J. V., 5 R.**
Munsters Fus., attd. R. Irish Rif.
- O'Brien, Lt. Thomas Kevin, 6 Conn.**
Rangers.
- O'Brien, Lt. Timothy John Aloy-**
sius, R.F.A.
- O'Brien, Sec.-Lt. Walter Vincent,**
Cheshire Regt.
- O'Brien, Major Wulstan Hubert,**
R.E.
- O'Brien-Butler, Capt. Charles Paget,**
R.A.M.C. attd. 5 Lancers.
- O'Brien-Butler, Capt. Capel Des-**
mond, M.C., R. Irish Regt.
- O'Bryen, Sec.-Lt. Myles Wheeler,**
R. Warwickshire Regt.
- O'Callaghan, Sec.-Lt. James, Ches-**
hire Regt.
- O'Callaghan, Sec.-Lt. Thomas Fran-**
cis, Leicester Regt.
- O'Carroll, Sec.-Lt. Francis Brendan,**
6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- O'Connell, Sec.-Lt. Donald Charles,**
Conn. Rangers, attd. Innisk. Fus.
- O'Connell, Lt. Maurice James,**
R.F.A.
- O'Connor, Capt. Arthur Cathal,**
M.C., Norfolk Regt.
- O'Connor, Capt. Hubert. Michael,**
M.C., Shropshire L.I.
- O'Connor, Sec.-Lt. John McC.,**
Highland L.I.
- O'Connor, Sec.-Lt. Joseph H., R.**
Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Connor, Capt. Richard Dominick,**
R.A.M.C.
- O'Connor, Richard Hemsleigh, New**
Zealand Infantry.
- O'Connor, Sec.-Lt. Roderic Alan**
Edward, Leinster Regt.
- O'Connor, Lt.-Col. William Moyle,**
6 London Field Ambulance.
- O'Connor-Glynn, Lt. Ernest Patrick,**
R.A.F.
- O'Donahoe, Lt.-Col. James Vincent**
Patrick, D.S.O., Quebec Regt.
- O'Donahue, Sec.-Lt. Thomas, Man-**
chester Regt.
- Oddie, Lt. Francis Arthur Joseph,**
Middlesex Regt., attd. R. Berks
Regt.
- O'Donnell, Sec.-Lt. Anthony Patrick**
York and Lancaster Regt.
- O'Donnell, Capt. Frederick Albert,**
R.A.M.C.
- O'Donnell, Lt. Hugh Nial, Welsh**
Regt.
- O'Donnell, Sec.-Lt. Michael, Austra-**
lian Infantry.
- O'Donnell, Sec.-Lt. Percy, R.F.A.**
- O'Donoghue, Sec.-Lt. Humphrey**
Patrick, 1 King's Liverpool Regt.
- O'Duffy, Lt. Kevin Emmet, 7 R.**
Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Dwyer, Sec.-Lt. John, R. Irish**
Fusiliers.
- O'Dwyer, Sec.-Lt. Robert, 9 R.**
Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Farrell, Sec.-Lt. Hugh, Irish**
Guards.
- O'Ferrall, Sec.-Lt. Brendan Hynds,**
R.F.A.
- O'Flahertie, Lt. Gordon J. A.**
Swifts, Shropshire L.I.
- O'Flynn, Capt. Dominick T.,**
R.A.M.C.
- O'Flynn, Sec.-Lt. Francis Joseph,**
R. Munster Fusiliers.
- O'Flynn, Sec.-Lt. George Bernard,**
R.A.F.

A Roll of Honour

- O'Flynn**, Lt. Michael Joseph, M.D., R.A.M.C.
O'Hara, Lt. Henry Eyre, R.A.F.
O'Hara, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Gilbert Warwick, E. Surrey Regt., attd. R. Berks Regt.
O'Kane, Lt. Paul, R. Irish Rifles.
O'Keefe, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Richard, 11 Loyal N. Lancers.
O'Keefe, Lt. William Henry, R.F.A.
O'Kelly, Capt. Henry Arundell de Pentheny, 18 Hussars.
O'Leary, Major John, M.B., I.M.S.
O'Longan, Sec.-Lt. Paul Charles Stacpoole, 2 Bn. R.I. Regt., attd. R.F.C.
O'Malley, Lce.-Cpl. Colman Geoffrey R. Dublin Fusiliers.
O'Malley, Sec.-Lt. William Joseph, 6 London Bde., R.F.A., T.F., attd. T.M.B.
Ommanney, Capt. Rupert, R.E.
O'Neil, Lt. Roderick, W. Riding Regt.
O'Neill, Sec.-Lt. Frederick, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
O'Neill, Sec.-Lt. James Dominick, R. Munster Fusiliers.
O'Reilly, Lt. Frank Power, R.N.
O'Reilly, Lt. Gerald J., Lincs Regt.
O'Reilly, Capt. Patrick Joseph, M.C. and Bar, R.A.M.C., attd 8 Yorks Regt.
Orford, Capt. Ernest Charles, King's Liverpool Regt.
Ormerod, Sec.-Lt. J.
Orleans and Braganza, Capt. Antoine Gaston Philippe, Prince of, M.C., A.D.C., R. Can. Dragoons.
O'Rorke, Lt. Daniel, R.G.A.
O'Shea, Lt. Dermot Patrick, I.A., 69 Punjaubis.
O'Sullivan, Rev. Donald, C.F. in France.
O'Sullivan, Sec.-Lt. Fergus, N. Staffs Regt and R.F.C.
O'Sullivan, Capt. Gerald Robert, V.C., 1 R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
O'Sullivan, Sec.-Lt. Horace A., R.G.A.
O'Sullivan, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Henry, 6 N. Staffs Regt.
O'Sullivan, Sec.-Lt. J. A., R.F.C.
O'Sullivan, Lt. T. G., R.E.
O'Sullivan-Beare, Patrick John, R.E.
Ouchterlony, Major John Palgrave Heathcote, D.S.O., R.E.
Outram, Alexander Robert, Pte., R. Fusiliers.
Pace, Capt. Henry Joseph, R.M.A.
Pace, Lce.-Cpl. Thomas Andrew, London Rifle Bde.
Papineau, Major Talbot Mercer, M.C., Can. Infantry.
Park, Lce.-Cpl. Colin Archibald Mungo, R. Sussex Regt.
Parker, Sec.-Lt. Gilbert Edmund Anthony, 2 S. Staffs Regt.
Parle, Capt. John Audley, M.C., 12 King's Liverpool Regt.
Parsons, Capt. Edgar V.P., Worcs Regt.
Parsons, Sec.-Lt. Leo Bernard, 8 East Kent Regt.
Partridge, Lt. B. G. N. G., attd. 2 Rajputs, I.A.
Patey, Capt. Robert Thomas, M.C., Liverpool Regt.
Pauling, Lt. George Francis, M.C., Grenadier Guards.
Pearce, Capt. Henry Goold, M.C., R.E.
Peet, Sec.-Lt. John Edward Grimston, 9 Bn. R. W. Surrey Regt.
Pegum, Capt. Joseph P., R.A.M.C.
Pendleton, Engr.-Comdr. Frank R. R.N.
Peniston-Bird, Cuthbert, 2 Australian Infantry Bn.
Peniston-Bird, Lewis, Hon. Arty. Co.
Pereira, Capt. Adrian O'Donnell, W. Riding Regt.
Perram, Capt. George Terence Clements, R.G.A.
Perry, Henry John, 13 (Kensington) Bn. London Regt.
Perry, Lt. Percy L. C., Sherwood Foresters.
Pery, Sec.-Lt. Cecil de Vere, 1 Middlesex Regt.
Petre, A/Sqdn.-Comdr. John Joseph, D.S.C., R.N.A.S.
Petre, Lionel George Carroll, 16 Baron, Capt. 4 Coldstream Gds.
Petre, Cpl. Robert, Canterbury Bn., New Zealand Infantry.
Phelan, Rev. Stewart Joseph, O.M.I. Naval Chaplain, 1 Cruiser Sqdn.
Philip, Sec.-Lt. Gerald Huntly, Hants Regt.
Pickering, Lt. George Anthony Raymond, Northampton Regt.
Pilkington, Lt. Joseph B., 1 Northampton Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Plowden**, Capt. Francis Charles, Yeom., attd. Shropshire L.I.
- Plowden**, Capt. Godfrey Bruce Aloysius, R. Welsh Fusiliers.
- Plunkett**, Sub-Lt. Gerald, Collingwood Bn., R.N. Division.
- Pontifex**, Capt. Dudley A., Scottish Rifles.
- Pope**, Sec.-Lt. J. H. (Jack), R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Pope-Hennessy**, Lt. Brian, M.C., S. African Infantry.
- Pope-Hennessy**, Lt. H., Alberta Regt., Canadian Infantry.
- Powell**, Sec.-Lt. Alban Wentworth, D.C.M., Queen's R. W. Surrey Regt.
- Power**, Bernard Francis Teevan, 2/3 N. Middlesex Field Ambulance, R.A.M.C.
- Power**, Lt. Pierce Michael Joseph, R.A.M.C.
- Power**, Sec.-Lt. Raphael Joseph, Indian Infantry.
- Power**, Sec.-Lt. William Boyle, R.F.C.
- Pownall**, Sec.-Lt. Hubert Joseph, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Prendergast**, Rev. Matthew V., C.F.
- Prendergast**, Sec.-Lt. James Francis, 6 R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Prendiville**, Sec.-Lt. Lawrence A., King's Liverpool Regt.
- Prentis**, Comdr. Osmond James, R.N.
- Priestman**, Sec.-Lt. George Aloysius, Northumbd. Fusiliers.
- Prior**, Lt. John Peter, Tyneside Irish, Northumbd. Fusiliers.
- Prismall**, Lt. Merrick Orville, R.F.A. and R.F.C.
- Pritchard**, Dom. John Placid, O.S.B., Capt. Russian Medical Service.
- Prunty**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Gerald Fitzroy, I.A., R.O. (Lancers, I.A.)
- Punch**, Surg. Sidney Edward, R.N.
- Purcell**, Lt. Charles Francis, Irish Guards.
- Purgold**, Lt. Louis E., R.F.C.
- Purgold**, Sergt. Raymond, King's Liverpool Regt.
- Quigley**, Sec.-Lt. Christopher, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Quigley**, Lt. James Francis, M.B., Ch.B., R.A.M.C.
- Quin**, D. A., Scots Guards.
- Quin**, Lt. Desmond Hilary, R. W. Surrey Regt.
- Quin**, James Edward, 5 R. Highlanders of Canada, 13 Bn.
- Quinlan**, Sec.-Lt. Charles, Leinster Regt.
- Quinlan**, Lt. Harold Daniel, Hussrs.
- Quinlan**, Major Hugh, 15/1 Queensland Bn., Australian Infantry.
- Quinn**, Lt.-Col. John James Patrick, 117 Mahrattas, I.A.
- Quinn**, Sec.-Lt. John Patrick, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Quinn**, St. Louis, R. Innisk. Fus.
- Radcliffe**, Capt. Arthur Philip Joseph, M.C., R.F.A.
- Radcliffe**, Lt. Percival Alban Victor, Yorks Regt., attd. M.G.C. Cav.
- Randerson**, Capt. Robert, 6 Yorks Regt.
- Ratton**, Major Joseph Holroyd, R.G.A.
- Ratton**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid Holroyd, 22 R. W. Surrey Regt. (T.F.)
- Raymond-Barker**, Major Richard, M.C., R.A.F.
- Rayner**, Sec.-Lt. George Biddulph, Essex Regt., attd. 2 Glos Regt.
- Readman**, Sec.-Lt. W., Loyal N. Lancs Regt.
- Réaumé**, Lt. J. S., Quebec Regt.
- Reddie**, Lt. Francis Graham, R.N.A.S.
- Redmond**, Lt. H. F., R.A.F.
- Redmond**, Surg.-Probationer Raymond O'Connell, R.N.V.R.
- Redmond**, Major William Hoey Kearney, M.P., R. Irish Regt.
- Reeve**, Capt. D'Arcy Wentworth, Suffolk Regt. and R.F.C.
- Reid**, Sec.-Lt. Bernard, 9 R. Dublin Fusiliers (Irish Bde.).
- Reidy**, Capt. Edmond McAnuliffe, Manchester Regt.
- Reynolds**, George, Pts., 9 Bn. Loyal N. Lancs.
- Reynolds**, Capt. Thomas James, R. Irish Rifles.
- Rice**, Lt. Arthur Hugh Hamilton, 114 Mahrattas, I.A.
- Rice**, Reginald Louis, R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Riddell**, Sec.-Lt. William, Devonshire Regt.
- Riley**, Midshipman Herbert Lawson, R.N.
- Riley**, Lt. James Louis, Liverpool Regt.

A Roll of Honour

- Rimer**, Sec.-Lt. William Marshall, York and Lancaster Regt.
- Riorden**, Sec.-Lt. Timothy Harold, K.O.Y.L.I.
- Robertson**, Lt. Herbert Charles, R.F.A.
- Roche**, Sec.-Lt. Donald J., R.A.F.
- Roche**, Edmund Joseph Knight, Pte., 2 Leinsters and M.G.C.
- Roche**, Capt. Francis H., A.V.C.
- Roche**, Flight-Comdr. and Capt. Hyacinth Albert, R.F.C. and R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Roche**, Capt. James Patrick, M.C., Leinster Regt. and T.M.B.
- Roche**, Lt. Patrick Joseph, M.C., I.A.R.O.
- Roche**, Sub-Lt. William Herbert, B.A., R.N.V.R.
- Rodgers**, Sec.-Lt. E., Scottish Rifles.
- Rogers**, Sec.-Lt. Gerald, R.F.A., H.A.C.
- Rogerson**, Capt. W. E., Adj., 12 Durham L.I.
- Rooke**, Lt. Charles Douglas Willoughby, Cameronians.
- Rooney**, Lt. Bruno M., 1 K.O.S.B.
- Rooney**, Major Gerald Christopher, R.M.L.I.
- Rooney**, Capt. Richard James, R.E.
- Roope**, Sec.-Lt. Charles F., 16 R. Fusiliers.
- Rose**, Capt. John Alexander, W. Yorks Regt.
- Rose**, Staff-Capt. Philip Vivian, 63 Infantry Bde., 21 Divn.
- Ross**, Sec.-Lt. Edward, Manchester Regt.
- Rottmann**, Sec.-Lt. Richard Charles, 3 E. Surrey Regt.
- Rouillard**, Lt. and Adj. Charles Louis Amédée, Lancers.
- Ruane**, Lt. John Patrick, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Ruck**, Lt. Laurence Humphrey, 1 Worcs Regt.
- Rudman**, Lt. Aloysius John, R. Warwickshire Regt.
- Russell**, Sec.-Lt. T. E. F., 2/5 York and Lancaster Regt.
- Russell**, Capt. Thomas L., King's African Rifles.
- Buxton**, Lt. Wilfrid Hay, R. Irish Regt. and R.A.F.
- Ryan**, Lt. Charles Michael Joseph, M.C., R. Munster Fusiliers.
- Ryan**, Major Clement Ignatius, Essex Regt.
- Ryan**, Lt. Edward St. Vincent, R.M.L.I.
- Ryan**, Capt. Francis Finlay, M.C., Liverpool Regt.
- Ryan**, Lt. H. J., Australian Inf.
- Ryan**, Capt. James Henry Aloysius, M.C., 1 King's Liverpool Regt.
- Ryan**, Sec.-Lt. Patrick Cornelius, E. Lancs Regt.
- Rymer**, Capt. John Henry, 11 Manchester Regt.
- St. Aubyn**, Lt. Francis Joseph, K.R.R.C.
- Sang**, Lt. Alfred, Intelligence Officer.
- Savory**, Capt. Francis Richard Egerton, 1 King's Shropshire L.I.
- Scallan**, Lt. Richard Talbot, R.G.A.
- Sears**, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Patrick, Oxford and Bucks L.I.
- Segrave**, Sec.-Lt. Philip, R.A.F.
- Segrave**, Lt. William Henry, R.F.C.
- Shanley**, Sec.-Lt. Andrew, 2 Northumbd. Fusiliers, att'd. M.G.C.
- Sharples**, Lt. George, King's Liverpool Regt.
- Shaughnessy**, Capt. the Hon. Alfred T., Canadian Infantry.
- Shearman**, Lt. Ambrose A., London Regt.
- Sheehan**, Sec.-Lt. Cornelius, R.M.F. and R.F.C.
- Sheehan**, Lt. Daniel Joseph, R.F.C.
- Sheehan**, Sec.-Lt. Martin Joseph, R.A.F.
- Shell**, Sec.-Lt. Charles, 1 Bn. R. Munster Fusiliers and R.A.F.
- Shepard**, Sec.-Lt. Bernard Anthony, R.F.A.
- Shepard**, Lt. Norbert Gerald, R.F.A.
- Shepherd**, Capt. Philip, 1 Essex Regt.
- Shepherd**, Lt. John Cuthbert, 4 Lancs Fusiliers.
- Sheridan**, Sec.-Lt. Charles J., R.A.F.
- Sheridan**, Sec.-Lt. Daniel, M.C., D.C.M., 2 Highland L.I.
- Sheridan**, Capt. Henry R., 6 Conn. Rangers.
- Sherlock**, Capt. Gerard Lourdes, 3 Hussars and Nigeria Regt.
- Shiel**, Sec.-Lt. John Hubert Trevor, Dorset Regt.
- Shine**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Patrick, 1 R. Irish Fusiliers.
- Shine**, Rev. James, C.F. (diocese of Dunkeld).
- Shine**, Capt. James Owen Williams, R. Dublin Fusiliers.

A Roll of Honour

- Shine**, Sec.-Lt. John Denis, R. Irish Regt.
Shortall, Lt. Richard J., 1 Newfld. Regt.
Sibeth, Sec.-Lt. C. G. Austin, R.E.
Silmon, Sec.-Lt. W. O. de Weld, W. Yorks Regt.
Silvertop, Comdr. Arthur Edward, R.N.
Silvertop, Sec.-Lt. Francis Somerled Joseph, Oxfordshire Yeom. and R.F.C.
Silvertop, Capt. William Alexander, M.C., 20 Hussars.
Simpson, Lt. W. H. M., E. Surrey Regt.
Siordet, Sec.-Lt. Gerald C., M.C., Rifle Bde.
Smith, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Basil, S. Lancs Regt.
Smith-Grant, Sec.-Lt. Joseph Basil, S. Lancs Regt.
Smith-Grant, Capt. John Gordon Smith, Cheetham Hill, R. Scots and R.A.F.
Smith-Sligo, Lt. Archibald George, R. J., 3 Cameron Highlanders.
Smithwick, Capt. James A., 4 R. Irish Regt.
Smyth, Sec.-Lt. Philip J., Conn. Rangers, attd. R.F.C.
Snead-Cox, Sec.-Lt. Geoffrey Philip Joseph, R. Welsh Fusiliers.
Snead-Cox, Midshipman Herbert A., R.N.
Snead-Cox, Sec.-Lt. Richard Mary, R. Scots.
Somers, Noel Travers Edgeworth, A.I.F., 60 Bn.
Sowter, Capt. George H. J., 5 Lincs Regt.
Spencer, Flight-Sub-Lt. Thomas Seymour, R.N.A.S.
Stanton, Capt. George, M.D., R.A.M.C., attd. Lancs Fusiliers.
Stanton, Sec.-Lt. Robert, 6 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Stapleton-Bretherton, Sec.-Lt. Osmond Frederick J., 9 Lancers.
Stein, Sec.-Lt. John F., R. Irish Rifles.
Stewart, Capt. Henry Edward, R. Sussex Regt.
Stewart, Lt. James Alexander Logen, 1 Rifle Bde.
Stewart, Sec.-Lt. James, King's Liverpool Regt.
Stewart, Sec.-Lt. Osmer Noel, M.C., R.F.A.
Stokes, Folliott Arthur, 2 Bn., E. Surrey Regt.
Stonor, Sec.-Lt. Cuthbert Antony, R. Inniskg. Fusiliers.
Stonor, Sec.-Lt. Hon. Howard Carew, 4 Beds Regt.
Stowell, Sec.-Lt. Robert Cuthbert, K.O. R. Lancaster Regt.
Stowell, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid, 2 Leinster Regt.
Strange, Asst.-Paymaster Charles Stuart, R.N.
Strickland, Rev. Joseph, C.F., S.J. (Roman Province).
Stuart, Lt. Cyril G. Johnstone, E. Yorkshire Regt.
Stuart, Sec.-Lt. William Aloysius, Highland L.I.
Sullivan, Eugene, A.M.C., A.I.F.
Sullivan, Lce.-Cpl. Thomas Barry, 1 Australian E.F.
Sullivan, Lt. Timothy, R. Munster Fusiliers.
Sullivan, Sec.-Lt. W. E., M.C., Welsh Regt.
Summers, Capt. Michael F., 1 Newfoundland Regt.
Sweetman, Major Michael James Joseph, 2 Worcs Regt. attd. 2 Dorset Regt.
Swindells, Lt.-Col. Geoffrey Hillier, 4 Cheshire Regt. (T.).
Symon, Lt. John, K.O. Yorks L.I.
Symons, Sec.-Lt. James Antony Christian, R. Sussex Regt.
Synnott, Sec.-Lt. Walter Pierre, Dragoon Guards and M.G.C.
Tate, Lt. Alan C. R., R.A.F.
Tate, Sec.-Lt. Herbert Lloyd, R.F.A.
Taunton, Sec.-Lt. Cuthbert André Patmore, 7 S. Staffs Regt.
Taylor, Lt. John Allingham Churchill R.N., R.A.F.
Taylor, Lt. William Ulric Chevallier, R. W. Kent Regt. attd. 46 R. Fus.
Taylor, Lt. Charles Edward, 1 W. Yorks Regt.
Taylor, Capt. Robert Valentine, R. Warwickshire Regt. attd. Loyal N. Lancs.
Taylor, Capt. William Aloysius, 5 S. Lancs Regt.
Teague, Sec.-Lt. Cyril.
Teeling, Lt. Ambrose Mary Anthony Norfolk Regt.
Teeling, Capt. Luke Joseph, R.F.A.

A Roll of Honour

- Tempest**, Lt. Oswald Aiden, A.S.C.,
attd. W. Yorks Regt.
- Tempest**, Major Wilfrid Norman,
K.O.Y.L.I.
- Thomas**, Capt. Matthew, 7 Loyal N.
Lancs Regt.
- Thompson**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril, Lancs
Fusiliers.
- Thompson**, Sec.-Lt. Philip Aloysius
Xavier Murray, 3 R. Inniskg.
Fusiliers.
- Thorley**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid B., 8 N.
Staffs Regt.
- Thornton**, Sec.-Lt. Stanislaus B., S.
Staffs Regt.
- Thornton**, Sec.-Lt. Wilfrid T., Black
Watch.
- Thornton**, Lt.
- Throckmorton**, Lt.-Col. Richard
Courtenay Brabazon, R. Welsh
Fusiliers.
- Thunder**, Sec.-Lt. Michael Hubert
Francis, R.F.C.
- Tidmarsh**, Lt. John M., W. Riding
Regt. and R.A.F.
- Tierney**, Sec.-Lt. Herbert S., 8
Cheshire Regt.
- Tigar**, Sec.-Lt. Harold Walter, 3
Middlesex Regt.
- Tigar**, Bertram Benoit, 2 Rifle Bde.
- Tighe**, Capt. James Patrick, 1 R.
Irish Regt.
- Timony**, Lt. Patrick Charles Law-
rence, Highland L.I.
- Tobin**, Capt. Richard Patrick, 7 R.
Dublin Fusiliers.
- Tolhurst**, Sec.-Lt. Alfred Wilfrid,
R.F.C.
- Tolhurst**, Sec.-Lt. Bernard Joseph,
11 W. Riding Regt. and R.F.C.
- Toms**, Flight Sub-Lt. Francis
Hamilton, R.N.
- Treacy**, Sec.-Lt. Michael, R. Dublin
Fusiliers.
- Trevor-Jones**, Sec.-Lt. Edward
Evan, Rifle Bde.
- Trevor-Jones**, Capt. John Eric,
M.C., Rifle Bde.
- Trickett**, Sec.-Lt. Andrew, York and
Lancaster Regt.
- Trueman**, Capt. Charles Fitzgerald
Hamilton, Manchester Regt.
- Tucker**, Sec.-Lt. S. W. J. B., 25
King's Liverpool Regt.
- Tumilty**, Sec.-Lt. Austin, R. Dublin
Fusiliers.
- Turnbull**, Lt. Gerard Illtyd, Welsh
Regt.
- Turnbull**, Capt. John Oswin, Welsh
Regt.
- Turner**, Sec.-Lt. Gilbert Austin, 3
R. W. Kent Regt., attd. 7 Loyal
N. Lancs Regt.
- Twomey**, Lt. Francis O'Connor,
Australian Infantry.
- Twomey**, Sec.-Lt. Francis P., 54
Sikhs I.A.
- Tyndall**, Lt. Joseph Charles, 4 R.
Dublin Fusiliers.
- Tyrrell**, Sec.-Lt. Francis Chichester
Victor, Coldstream Guards.
- Tyrrell**, Lt. Hugo William Louis,
R.N.
- Udall**, Sergt. Wilfrid, 17 K. Liver-
pool Regt.
- Underhill**, Sec.-Lt. Hugh Caulfield,
attd. 1/6 Gurkha Rifles.
- Unsworth**, Sec.-Lt. Cyril J., S.
Lancs Regt.
- Uppley**, Capt. Wyvill Charles
Spinola, R. Sussex Regt.
- Valiquet**, Lt. E. A., Quebec Regt.
- Vardon**, Sec.-Lt. Evelyn F. Claude,
R. Dublin Fusiliers.
- Vaucour**, Major Awdry Morris,
M.C., D.F.C., R.A. and R.A.F.
- Vaughan**, Sec.-Lt. Charles Alvarez,
7 Seaforth Highlanders.
- Vaughan**, Capt. J. L., E. Surrey
Regt.
- Vaughan**, Major George Edmund,
M.C., Coldstream Guards.
- Vaughan**, Major Henry Humphres-
ton Scott, R.F.A.
- Vaughan**, Sec.-Lt. Kenelm C., Irish
Guards.
- Vavasour**, Sec.-Lt. G., N.Z. Infantry.
- Vavasour**, Lt. Rollo, R.F.C.
- Verity**, Sec.-Lt. G., Lancs Fusiliers.
- Vernon**, Lt. Henry Doone, R.N.A.S.
- Vernon**, Sqdn. Comdr. Theophilus
C., R.N.A.S.
- Waite**, Lt. Charles James, Conn.
Rangers.
- Waldron**, Major Francis Fitzgerald,
19 Hussars and R.F.C.
- Walker**, Sec.-Lt. Richard, 2/5 Lancs
Fusiliers.
- Wall**, Asst.-Paymaster Frederick
Tobin, R.N.
- Wall**, Sec.-Lt. Michael, R. Irish
Regt.
- Walmesley**, Flight-Lt. Oswald Noel,
R.N.
- Walsh**, Sec.-Lt. John Joseph, Conn.
Rangers.

A Roll of Honour

- Walsh**, Capt. John Parnell, Can. A.M.C., attd. Can. Infantry.
Walsh, Major J., R. Fusiliers.
Walsh, Sec.-Lt. Martin Oliver, K.O.Y.L.I.
Walsh, Lt. Patrick Joseph, M.B., I.M.S.
Walsh, Lt. Philip J., R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Walsh, Lt. Stephen Barry, R.A.M.C., M.D.
Walton, Philip, B. L., Singapore Vol. R.F.A.
Ward, Capt. Arthur Claude, D.S.O., Lancs Fusiliers.
Ward, Sec.-Lt. Bernard, 1 Bn. Dublin Fusiliers.
Ward, Fleet-Paymaster Henry de Courcy, R.N.
Ward, Major John Simeon, Can. L.I.
Ward, Lce.-Cpl. Philip Edgar, 10 Liverpool Scottish.
Warter, Sec.-Lt. Gordon, R.F.C.
Warter, Lt. William Henry, Wilts Regt. and M.G.C.
Waters, Capt. Charles Louis, M.C., R. Berks Regt.
Waterton, Sec.-Lt. John Edward Mary Claude Pius Augustine, Beds Regt.
Watkins, Capt. Iltyd Edward Maitland, 2 Mon. Regt. (T.F.).
Watson, Rev. Charles, C.S.S.R., C.F.
Watters, Rev. John, C.F.
Wegg-Prosser, Lt. Cecil Francis, Rifle Bde.
Weir, Engr.-Lt.-Comdr. Frederick Stanley, R.N.
Weld, Sec.-Lt. Edward Joseph, R.F.A.
Weld, Capt. Thomas Joseph Wilfrid, M.C. and Bar, Lovat's Scouts and King's African Rifles.
Weld-Blundell, Sec.-Lt. Richard Shireburne, 7 King's Liverpool Regt.
Welman, Lt. Henry Bolton, R.M.
Westwood, Sec.-Lt. James N., S. Staffs Regt.
Whelan, Lt. Cyril, R.A.F.
White, Capt. Edward Erskine, 1 Northants Regt.
White, Lt. James M., A.V.C.
Whitefoord, Rev. Charles Blaquhoun, C.F.
Whitehead, Lt. Eric J., R.A.F.
Whitehead, Sec.-Lt. John Robert Gobertus, R.F.C.
Whitgreave, Sec.-Lt. Henry Egerton, Somerset L.I.
Whittam, Lt. Francis J., Lancs Fusiliers.
Whitty, Capt. John Leo, M.C., Leinster Regt., attd. R.F.C.
Whitty, Lce.-Cpl. Thomas A., 7 R. Dublin Fusiliers.
Wickham, Capt. William Joseph, Scots Guards.
Wickham, Capt. Cyril H., 1 R. Fusiliers.
Wighton, Capt. Charles, 1 Newfoundland Regt.
Wildsmith, Sec.-Lt. Leonard Charles, 12 London R. Queen Victoria Rif.
Wildsmith, Sec.-Lt. Raymond Charles, 25 London Regt.
Williams, Midshipman Charles Lawrence Wyndham, R.N.
Williams, Lt. George Stewart Louis Stevens, R. Welsh Fusiliers.
Williams, Sec.-Lt. Leonard, 2 S. Wales Borderers.
Williams, Sec.-Lt. Maxwell Henry, London Regt.
Williams, Major Oswald, 1 Monmouthshire Regt.
Williams, Lt. Philip Clarence, 10 Hants Regt.
Williams, Sec.-Lt. Stuart Duncan, Household Bn.
Willis, Lt. Ambrose, London Regt.
Willis, Lt. John Galbraith Tobin, A.S.C., attd. R.F.C.
Wilmot, Lt. Paul, R. Sussex Regt.
Wilson, Sec.-Lt. Henry Middlesex Regt.
Wilson, Sec.-Lt. C. Oscar, 5 Essex Regt.
Wisely, Lt. Francis J., R.A.M.C.
Wiseman, Sec.-Lt. Vincent H., K.O. Yorks L.I.
Withall, Sec.-Lt. John, R. Fusiliers.
Wolseley, Sec.-Lt. William Joseph 2 E. Lancs Regt.
Wood, Sec.-Lt. Almeric, 3 Oxford and Bucks L.I.
Wood, George G. B., Rifmn., London Regt.
Wood, Lt. Guy Crawford, 1 Welsh Guards.
Wood, Capt. John Patrick Hamilton, Manchester Regt.
Wood, Tpr. Lionel Godfrey, Can. Mtd. Rifles.
Wood, Sub-Flight-Lt. Peter Crawford, R.N.A.S.

A Roll of Honour

Woodcock, Cpl. Thomas, V.C., 2 Bn.
Irish Guards.

Woodlock, Sec.-Lt. Francis Joseph,
K.R.R.C.

Woodward, Lt. Charles Francis, R.
Welsh Fusiliers.

Worden, Artificer Arthur William,
R.N.

Worsley-Worswick, Sec.-Lt. Basil,
2 King Edward's Horse.

Wray, Sec.-Lt. Cormac P. J., 8
Inniskg. Fusiliers.

Wrenford, Capt. A/Lt.-Col. Arthur
Leonard, E. Lancs Regt.

Wright, Sec.-Lt. Thomas, 2 R. Berks
Regt.

Yates, Lt. Charles Cecil, 9 Loyal N.
Lancs Regt.

Yeatman, Allen Patrick, 9 Bn., Aus-
tralian I.F.

Young, William, V.C., Pte., E.
Lancs Regt.

Ziani de Ferranti, Major Basil, M.C.,
R.G.A.







LITURGY *for* LAYFOLK

A NEW AND UNIFORM SERIES OF THE
LATIN-ENGLISH TEXTS, FINELY PRINTED
THROUGHOUT IN RED & BLACK

THE publication of *The Missal for the Laity* in Latin and English, with the rubrics printed in the traditional colour, was made possible by that revival of interest in Liturgy which distinguishes the Catholic layfolk of this time and of this country. To have a part in the development of this liturgical movement, to supply its demand for certain books, to forestall and so to stimulate its desire for others, and also to attempt to revive in current liturgical printing those true traditions of craftsmanship which have been obscured for two hundred years, has now become the policy, as it has long been the ambition, of the publishers. All the volumes of the series are uniform in size and typography with *The Missal*.

THE DAY HOURS OF THE CHURCH. The complete text of the *Horæ Diurnæ* in Latin and English. Edited by the Benedictines of Stanbrook Abbey. With an introduction by Abbot Fernand Cabrol, O.S.B. Printed on toned Oxford India paper, about 1,000 pages. From 9s. 6d. to 32s.

THE MISSAL FOR THE LAITY. The new impression has been revised from cover to cover by Dr. Adrian Fortescue, who equips it also with an historical introduction, and it is now in entire conformity with the most recent reforms. Printed on toned Oxford India paper. Prices from 9s. to 48s.

THE RITE OF MARRIAGE, THE NUPTIAL MASS AND BLESSING, and the new Blessing without the Mass. With an Instruction on the significance of the Sacrament by His Lordship Bishop Butt. Vellum paper, 12s.

THE LAYFOLK'S RITUAL. The complete text, in Latin and English, of all those Offices of the Ritual at which layfolk have occasion to assist. With an historical introduction to each Office by Abbot Fernand Cabrol, O.S.B. Prices from 4s. 6d. to 22s. 6d.

THE PRYMER. In the Press.

The TABLET

A Weekly Newspaper and Review

PRICE: SIXPENCE

THE TABLET, founded in 1840, was acquired in 1868 by Cardinal Vaughan, who determined to supply to Catholic readers a paper expressing their own lofty ideals.

ITS reputation is established as that of a Catholic weekly with the scholarly authority of a Review as well as the lighter interest of a Newspaper.

IN breadth of outlook, in current learning, and in literary merit, THE TABLET provokes comparison with any of its non-Catholic contemporaries, and of late it has won fresh laurels in many quarters on account of its powerful articles on War topics and its capable summary of each week's happenings.

THE Publisher will be happy to forward a Specimen Copy of the current issue to any reader of THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

THE Subscription is 30/- per annum (post free), both Inland and Overseas.

The TABLET

19, Henrietta Street, London, W.C.

